

Columbia University  
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



GIVEN BY

*R. Arrowsmith*












A  
RELATION  
OF  
THE CONFERENCE  
BETWEEN  
WILLIAM LAUD,  
LATE  
LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,  
AND  
MR. FISHER THE JESUIT,  
BY THE COMMAND OF KING JAMES,  
OF EVER BLESSED MEMORY.  
WITH  
AN ANSWER  
TO SUCH EXCEPTIONS AS A. C. TAKES AGAINST IT.



OXFORD,  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

M DCCC XXXIX.

1 8 3 9

1937

937

23612

# P R E F A C E

TO

THE EDITION OF 1839.

---

A SHORT narrative of the circumstances which occasioned and accompanied this conference will be desirable for the general reader.

King James the First exposed himself during the whole of his reign to much observation on the part of the people in general, and to repeated complaints on the part of his parliaments, for the forbearance and clemency that he exercised towards his Roman catholic subjects. From the commencement of his reign, when he signified that he felt himself under personal<sup>a</sup> obligation to the pontiff, to the last year of it, when he received from the two houses of parliament “a<sup>b</sup> stinging petition against the papists,” whether he was em-

<sup>a</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. iv. p. 377. “We acknowledge ourselves personally so much beholding to the now bishop of Rome [Clement VIII.] for his kind offices and private temporal carriage towards us in many things.” *Comp. Rushworth*, vol. i. p. 166. *Hallam, Const. Hist.* vol. i. p. 437, note.

<sup>b</sup> *Rushworth*, vol. i. p. 140.

ployed in thwarting the designs of the puritans, or negotiating for the marriage of his son with the infanta of Spain, he continually kept alive suspicions of his Romish tendencies, which neither his frequent professions of neutrality, nor his learned treatises against the usurpations and corruptions of popery, were sufficient to overcome. Whatever might be the speculative opinions of the king, it is clear that the character of his mind, and the principles of his government, civil and ecclesiastical, were in accordance with the genuine spirit of the Vatican; and it was natural for his subjects to suppose that if he could have obtained full security for the acknowledgment of his supremacy as a sovereign, he would willingly have surrendered many of the theological points at issue, in order to a readmission into the Romish communion.

Now had circumstances been much less favourable to the Romanists, their wily policy would still have found materials and opportunities for converting them to their own advantage; but at a time when the powerful appeals, that they could make to the fears and imaginations of their hearers, had the appearance of being more reasonable from the utter want of unity among the protestants, and were actually more attractive, owing to the alleged favour of the court, they disregarded the severe penalties of the laws, and proclaimed openly the greater security of their profession of faith, and the rapid increase of their numbers. The king indeed still denounced, as crimes against the state, such offences as exercising the functions of a Romish priest, seducing his subjects from the religion established, and scandalizing his actual government; but his real intentions were interpreted much more from his acts of forbearance than from his threats of punishment, and in order

to make his views in this respect clearly understood, his protestant subjects were told that they had no right "to 'argue 'a concreto ad abstractum,' or to infer that he countenanced the Romish religion, because he conferred favours on the papists."

Among the emissaries whom the Romanists employed at this time in England, one of the most active and intelligent was a Jesuit of the name of Piersey, who has been better known under the assumed appellation of Fisher<sup>d</sup>. He had obtained admission to the countess, mother of Villiers, who was afterwards duke of Buckingham, and had made some progress in converting her to the Romish faith, in the hope that through the influence of her son, she might be able to obtain further indulgences from the court in favour of the Roman catholics. The duke of Buckingham, anxious that justice should be done to the whole of the important argument, requested Dr. Francis White<sup>e</sup>, who had obtained a reputation, from his sermons preached at St. Paul's, for skill in the Romish controversy, to meet the Jesuit, and maintain the cause of protestantism, in the presence of the countess, the lord keeper Williams, and himself. An occurrence of so much interest, con-

<sup>e</sup> See a letter of the lord keeper Williams in the Cabala, p. 294.

<sup>d</sup> He was a native of Yorkshire, and after having studied at Rome and Louvain, became a Jesuit in the year 1594. He soon afterwards employed himself in England in making proselytes, and was convicted and banished. He returned, however, as soon as he found that it could be done safely, in the reign of James I., and is said to have died at the end of the year 1641. Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jes. p. 263. Ed. Antv. 1643.

<sup>e</sup> Dr. F. White, rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, and chaplain to the king, became dean of Carlisle in 1622; bishop of Carlisle in 1626; bishop of Norwich in 1628; and bishop of Ely in 1631. He died in February, 1637.

nected so directly with the person of the favourite, was soon communicated to the king; and a second conference was accordingly arranged, at which the king himself was present, and many particular questions of theology were discussed.

But there were two important points in which neither the king nor the countess was satisfied with the management of this conference. The king observed, that Fisher had been skilful, and not altogether unsuccessful, in replying to his opponent; but had not in the same degree established, by positive proof, any propositions of his own. The countess complained that nothing had been said respecting the claim which the Romanists make to a visible and infallible church; a claim which she seemed to consider as necessary for the existence of a church, and which, in weak and wavering minds, has ever inspired a feeling in favour of the communion of Rome. For this latter purpose it was determined that a third conference should be held; and Dr. Laud, then bishop of St. David's, who was distinguished for his theological learning, and had recently given the king evidence of his great skill in composition, was appointed to conduct the argument on the side of protestantism. To satisfy also the mind of the king as to the capacity of the Romanists for positive proof, he proposed nine questions to the Jesuit, on which he required to have distinct and categorical answers, prefacing them with this strong inducement, that "he desired satisfaction on some of the principal points, which withheld him from joining unto the church of Rome."

On the 24th of May, 1622, the third conference took place, between bishop Laud on the one part, and Fisher on the other, in the presence of the same royal and noble personages, and with the addition of others, and



more especially of the lord keeper Williams, who occasionally took part in the discussion.

The bishop states in his preface that he had “no instruction at all what should be the ground of this third conference, nor the full time of four and twenty hours to bethink himself;” and this is in accordance with the entries<sup>f</sup> which he made at the same time in his private diary. But it is also clear from the same authority, that he was acquainted with the earlier part of the discussion, and in some degree a party concerned in it, as it was going on; and there can be little doubt as to his perfect and ready knowledge of the whole subject matter of the controversy.

It appears that no notes were taken at the time by Dr. White, of the two first conferences, and that after-

<sup>f</sup> The following are the entries made in his diary in connection with this conference.

1622. April 23. Being the Tuesday in Easter week, the king sent for me, and set me into a course about the countess of Buckingham, who about that time was wavering in point of religion.

April 24. Dr. Francis White and I met about this.

May 10. I went to the court to Greenwich, and came back in coach with the lord marquess Buckingham. My promise then to give his lordship the discourse he spake to me for.

May 19. I delivered my lord marquess Buckingham the paper concerning the difference between the church of England and Rome, in point of salvation, &c.

May 23. My first speech with the countess of Buckingham.

May 24. The conference between Mr. Fisher, a Jesuit, and myself, before the lord marquess Buckingham, and the countess, his mother. I had much speech with her after.

June 9. Being Whit-Sunday, my lord marquess Buckingham was pleased to enter upon a near respect to me. The particulars are not for paper.

June 15. I became C. to my lord of Buckingham.

wards, when he drew up a memorial of them, he acknowledged that he <sup>g</sup> “did not exactly remember all the passages of the disputation.” It appears also that bishop Laud drew up a narrative of the third conference, during the Michaelmas term of 1622, but that in his case no doubt was expressed as to its perfect accuracy. As these papers were not published till the year 1624, it is necessary to explain why so long a silence should have been observed, on subjects too of so much interest and importance.

Although a strict injunction had been given that no account of these conferences should be published, which had not been seen and approved by both the parties engaged in them, Fisher did not neglect the opportunity they afforded him of circulating a relation of what had past, and expressing himself to the great disadvantage of his opponents. It is not necessary to suppose that he misrepresented them designedly; as in a controversy of that nature it was not possible that a person so educated, who had also taken so prominent a part in the dispute, should be able to hold the balance truly. The fact however was, that the arguments on the Protestant side appeared, as he represented them, to be extremely “unskilful and childish<sup>h</sup>,” and the whole discussion was exhibited in a manner disgraceful to his opponents and creditable to himself. This was in itself a sufficient reason with bishop Laud and Dr. White for setting forth, on their side, as faithful narratives as they could, of the three conferences; and this reason was much strengthened by the results of other disputations held about the same time, which the Jesuits, both in England and abroad, were describing according

<sup>g</sup> See White's preface, p. 3.

<sup>h</sup> White's preface, p. 3.

to their views of them, and employing for their own benefit. On the 27th of June, 1623, the same Dr. White was engaged in another discussion<sup>i</sup> of the same nature with Fisher, assisted by Dr. Featley on the one side, and a Jesuit, of the name of Sweet, on the other, at the house of Sir Humfrey Lynde, and in the presence of many of his friends. This discussion led to the publication of many letters and pamphlets, in which the Jesuits boasted of their success, and treated their opponents in a manner calculated to do much mischief, in common minds, to the Protestant cause. But it was still thought by bishop Laud and Dr. White to be too early to publish their respective narratives. They had not yet examined the answers which Fisher had been preparing to the king's nine questions, and they naturally wished the whole transaction to be included in one work, embracing the entire controversy, and giving them the advantage of appearing in the way of refutation, as well as in the more laborious work of positive proof.

The subjects proposed by king James to Fisher were the following. 1. The worship of images. 2. The prayers and offering oblations to the blessed Virgin Mary. 3. Worshipping and invocation of saints and angels. 4. The Liturgy and private prayers for the ignorant, in an unknown tongue. 5. Repetitions of Pater Nosters, Aves, and Creeds, especially affixing a kind of merit to the number of them. 6. The doctrine of transubstantiation. 7. Communion under one kind, and the abetting of it by concomitancy. 8. Works of supererogation, especially with reference unto the

<sup>i</sup> An account of it was published by Dr. Featley, under the title, "The Romish Fisher caught and held in his own net." London, 1624.

treasure of the church. 9. The opinion of deposing kings, and giving away their kingdoms by papal power, whether directly or indirectly. To these questions Fisher drew up his answer separately; but he prudently and dexterously omitted the last, alleging as his excuse, that “the constitutions of his order in severest manner charge him no ways to meddle in state-matters or in princes’ affairs; much less under pretence of religion, to attempt any thing or to consent to any enterprize that may disturb the quiet and tranquillity of kings and kingdoms.”

This work of Fisher was not published by him in the first instance, but was delivered to king James in writing, and was afterwards transferred, according to the king’s original intention, to Dr. White, to be examined and answered. Besides the arguments on the eight first questions, the work contained a preliminary dissertation on the rule of faith, the sum and substance of the two earlier conferences in which the writer had been engaged with Dr. White, and nine charges of remarkable error brought against the church of England, as a counterpoise to the nine questions propounded by the king. To this work of Fisher Dr. White sent forth his Reply, in April, 1624, reciting the whole of Fisher’s work in distinct portions, and adding his own comments and answers, with copious quotations of the authorities on which he relied. At the same time, and as an accompaniment to Dr. White’s Reply, was published, “An Answer<sup>1</sup> to Mr. Fisher’s Relation of the Third Conference,” drawn up in reality, as he afterwards acknowledged, by bishop Laud, but ascribed in the title-page to R. B. [Richard Baylie,] the bishop’s chaplain.

<sup>1</sup> It is noticed thus in the Diary, “April 16, Friday. My conference with Fisher the Jesuit, printed, came forth.”

Leaving then Dr. White's Reply, with the many publications from Fisher and others to which it gave occasion, our attention must now be confined to the third conference, and the Narrative of it which had been published by bishop Laud.

This Narrative naturally attracted much notice, and was generally assigned to its real author. The most important answer to it was a book published in the year 1626, and written, as was believed, by Fisher himself, under the assumed initials, A. C. Fisher, though he had fearlessly given his own name or initials in other instances, felt it necessary to be cautious in attacking an opponent of so much authority, and the more so, as he did not intend to be very scrupulous in his own mode of warfare. He used initials therefore, which would not lead to a discovery, and which he seems to have employed in another case in the year 1623, when he published<sup>m</sup> his account of the Conference, held in the house of Sir Humfrey Lynde. But for many years Dr. Laud, who in the year 1633 became archbishop of Canterbury, took no further notice of his antagonist. Oppressed by sickness, overwhelmed with public business, or mourning over the miseries of his country, he could not give either time or attention to a subject, in which, however deeply he was interested in it, and however earnestly he was solicited by others to undertake it, his services were not indispensably required. But having at length received from king Charles an expression of his wish, that the whole question, with Fisher's further observations, should be fully and finally discussed by him, he reconstructed his work in the enlarged and amended form in which we

<sup>m</sup> Under this title, "An Answer to a Pamphlet entituled, 'The Fisher caught in his owne net,' by A. C., 1623."

now have it, and published it in February<sup>n</sup>, 1639. It was a time at which the archbishop still felt himself at liberty to say, “The church of England<sup>o</sup> (God be thanked) thrives happily under a gracious prince, and well understands that a parliament cannot be called at all times; and that there are visible judges besides the law-books, and one supreme (long may he be, and be happy) to settle all temporal differences:” and yet within a few days afterwards (February 27th, 1639.) the king issued his declaration<sup>p</sup> of war against his northern subjects, which, in the distracted temper of those times, led by gradual but certain consequence to the overthrow of the church, the murder of the sovereign, and the destruction of all rational and established freedom.

The Archbishop’s edition of 1639 was reprinted in the year 1673, and again in 1686; but I have not met with a copy of any more recent impression.

The initials used in the course of this Relation are

℞. Bishop Laud.

℥. Fisher the Jesuit.

D. W. Dr. Francis White who disputed with Fisher in the two first Conferences.

L. K. Lord Keeper Williams, bishop of Lincoln, who took part occasionally in the dispute.

A. C. The initials under which Fisher replied to bishop Laud’s first printed account of his Conference.

There are two points connected with the contents of this work, on which it may be right to offer a few

<sup>n</sup> It is noticed thus in his Diary. “Feb. 10. My book against Fisher the Jesuit was printed, and this day, being Sunday, I delivered a copy to his majesty.”

<sup>o</sup> See p. 175.

<sup>p</sup> Rymer, Fœdera, vol. xx. p. 290.



observations. The one bears upon the question of the divine authority of the scriptures, the other upon their exclusive authority.

In the Archbishops' Preface we have the following passage. "According to Christ's institution, the scripture, where it is plain, should guide the church; and the church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the scripture; yet so, as neither the scripture should be forced, nor the church so bound up, as that upon just and further evidence, she may not revise that which in any case hath slipt by her." Now this rule, when compared with the 6th Article of the Church of England, appears to be expressed with too much latitude in favour of the church. If in endeavouring to interpret scripture on any point of faith, the result is doubt or difficulty, it would seem to be evident that, so far forth, the point in question was "neither read therein nor could be proved thereby," and that the church could not require that point as necessary to salvation. It is true, indeed, that different minds, according to their mode of training, will form different judgments in a given case as to the conclusiveness of the proof from scripture; and that the one party will appeal, however unprofitably, to the authority of the church, in order to supply the deficiency of proof which has been alleged by the other. But it is also true, that the party which feels the doubt will always have recourse to the rule of the 6th Article in justification of its scruples, and the dispute will terminate in the same difference of belief in which it was begun. The best, and indeed the common, illustration of the case is to be found in the practice of infant-baptism; and it is the more desirable to adduce it, because it can be given in the words

of the Archbishop himself, and will shew, by a definite and appropriate instance, in what manner, when applying his own rule, he limited and corrected it. “<sup>q</sup>I answer to the instance which A. C. makes concerning the baptism of infants, that it may be concluded directly (and let A. C. judge, whether not demonstratively) out of scripture, both that infants ought to be baptized, and that baptism is necessary to their salvation.” And again: “I will add this concerning this particular, the baptizing of infants, that the church received this by tradition from the apostles. By tradition. And what then? May it not directly be concluded out of scripture, because it was delivered to the church by way of tradition? I hope A. C. will never say so.” So then in his judgment, though the practice of infant-baptism was received by tradition, it rests for its authority upon scripture. Tradition, therefore, cannot give the proof, although it may be employed in the way of suggestion before the proof is sought, or in the way of confirmation when the proof is already given.

The other point to which it may be proper to advert is contained in the following statement. “<sup>s</sup>The way lies thus (as far as it appears to me); The credit of scripture to be divine resolves finally into that faith which we have touching God himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this hath three main grounds, to which all other are reducible. The first is, the tradition of the church; and this leads us to a reverend persuasion of it. The second is, the light of nature; and this shews us how necessary such a revealed learning is, and that no other way it can be had; nay more, that all proofs brought against any point of faith neither

<sup>q</sup> See p. 45.

<sup>r</sup> See p. 48.

<sup>s</sup> See p. 94.



are nor can be demonstrations, but soluble arguments. The third is, the light of the text itself, in conversing wherewith we meet with the Spirit of God inwardly inclining our hearts, and sealing the full assurance of the sufficiency of all three unto us. And then, and not before, we are certain that the scripture is the word of God, both by divine and by infallible proof: but our certainty is by faith, and so voluntary, not by knowledge of such principles as in the light of nature can enforce assent whether we will or no." This explanation will scarcely satisfy a reader of discriminating mind. The question here is clearly not respecting the time or order in which the minds of persons in a Christian country become sensible of the authority of scripture, but respecting the method and course of inquiry by which such authority is at any time to be ascertained: it is therefore not a question respecting the force of education or the teaching of the Church, but respecting the investigation of evidence, and the gradual construction of proof. The process then in such a case is this. The Christian scriptures are records of past events, and must be tested and interpreted by the common methods by which the genuineness and meaning of any documents of like date and language are ascertained. These steps fully secured, the contents are then to be examined, as to the degree of credit that attaches to them. Thus far the inquiry is one in which a man's judgment must decide for him; his own judgment altogether and exclusively, if he believe that he is competent to the task of examination; and again his own judgment in deference to that of others, if he is conscious that he is not competent; but still in both cases, his own judgment, whether he exercise it independently of others, or willingly place it under their

guidance, after acknowledging his own insufficiency and approving of their fitness. It is the same process which would be followed with respect to any historical records; but with this difference, that there is no other history whatever of remote events, which is attested by so many kinds and so high a degree of evidence, derived from earlier adaptations, from contemporary and unimpeachable witnesses, from corroborative and traditionary testimony, from the results that have been impressed on all succeeding times, and more especially from the clear and pervading tokens of God's providential government, all of which converge to the same point of moral demonstration. But now another principle interposes. The contents of these scriptures shew not only the trust-worthiness of the narrative, but also miraculous agency and a divine commission; and the question accordingly is so far changed, that though, as matter of evidence, it has hitherto been a case for private judgment, as matter of teaching it has now become a case for religious faith. On principles strictly rational, the mind must now surrender itself to the teaching of the scriptures as to a supreme and infallible authority; still exercising its judgment as to the meaning of that teaching, but on its own principles deferring to the judgment of those, whether individuals or bodies of men, who have had the best means of information, and have given distinct and authoritative opinions on the subject.

The Archbishop's deliberate opinion on the part that he had taken in this controversy may be given in the words delivered by him on his trial, with the addition that he made during his imprisonment in the Tower. "My <sup>s</sup> book against Fisher hath been charged against

<sup>s</sup> History of the Troubles and Trial, &c. by Wharton, p. 418.

me: where the argument must lie thus; I have endeavoured to advance Popery, because I have written against it. And with what strength I have written, I leave to posterity to judge, when the envy, which now overloads me, shall be buried with me. This I will say with St. Gregory Nazianzen, (whose success at Constantinople was not much unlike mine here, save that his life was not sought,) ‘I never laboured for peace to the wrong and detriment of Christian verity,’ nor I hope ever shall. [And let the church of England look to it; for in great humility I crave to write this (though then was no time to speak it) that the church of England must leave the way it is now going, and come back to that way of defence which I have followed in my book, or she shall never be able to justify her separation from the church of Rome].”

EDWARD CARDWELL.

ST. ALBAN'S HALL,  
March 16, 1839.

<sup>t</sup> Οὔτε εἰρηνεύομεν κατὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθείας ὑφιέντες τι διὰ δόξαν ἐπικεικίας. Greg. Naz. Orat. 32. vol. i. p. 518. Ed. Par. 1630.



TO  
HIS MOST SACRED MAJESTY,  
CHARLES,

BY THE GRACE OF GOD,

KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND,  
DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, &c.

DREAD SOVEREIGN,

**T**HIS tract will need patronage as great as may be had; that is yours. Yet, when I first printed part of it, I presumed not to ask any, but thrust it out at the end of another's labours, that it might seem at least to have the same patron, your royal father of blessed memory, as the other work on which this attended had. But now I humbly beg for it your Majesty's patronage, and leave withal that I may declare to your most excellent Majesty the cause why this Tract was then written; why it stayed so long before it looked upon the light; why it was not then thought fit to go alone, but rather be led abroad by the former work; why it comes now forth both with alteration and addition; and why this addition made not more haste to the press than it hath done.

The cause why this discourse was written was this: I was, at the time of these conferences with Mr. Fisher, bishop of St. David's; and not only directed, but commanded by my blessed master, king James, to this conference with him. He, <sup>a</sup>when we met, began with a great protestation of seeking the truth only, and that for itself. And certainly, truth, especially in religion, is so to be sought, or not to be found. He that seeks it with a Roman <sup>b</sup>bias or any other, will run counter when

<sup>a</sup> May 24, 1622.

<sup>b</sup> One of these biases is an aversion from all such truth as fits not our ends. And *aversus a veritatis luce, ob hoc luci veritatis adversus* (fit), &c. S.

August. lib. 5. cont. *Adversarium Legis et Prophet.* And it is an easy transition for a man that is averse from, to become adverse to the truth.

he comes near it, and not find it, though he come within kenning of it. And therefore I did most heartily wish I could have found the Jesuit upon that fair way he protested to go. After the conference ended, I went, whither my duty called me, to my diocess, not suspecting any thing should be made public that was both commanded and acted in private. For W. I., the publisher of the Relation of the first Conference with Dr. White, (the late reverend and learned bishop of Ely,) <sup>c</sup> confesses plainly, "That Mr. Fisher was straitly charged upon his allegiance from his majesty that then was, not to set out or publish what passed in some of these conferences till he gave license, and until Mr. Fisher and they might meet, and agree and confirm under their hands what was said on both sides." He says further, "That <sup>d</sup> Mr. Fisher went to Dr. White's house to know what he would say about the Relation which he had set out." So then, belike Mr. Fisher had set out the Relation of that conference before he went to Dr. White to speak about it. And this, notwithstanding the king's restraint upon him upon his allegiance. Yet to Dr. White, it is said, he went, but to what other end than to put a scorn upon him, I cannot see. For he went to his house to know what he would say about that Relation of the conference which he had set out before. In my absence from London, Mr. Fisher used me as well. For with the same care of his allegiance and no more, <sup>e</sup> he spread

<sup>c</sup> In the epistle to the reader.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid.

<sup>e</sup> These words were in my former epistle. And A. C. checks at them in defence of the Jesuit, and says, "That the Jesuit did not at all so much as in speech, and much less in papers, publish this or either of the other two conferences with Dr. White, till he was forced unto it by false reports given out to his private disgrace, and the prejudice of the catholic cause. Nor then did he spread papers abroad, but only delivered a very few copies to special friends, and this not with an intent to calumniate the bishop," &c. A. C. in his Preface before his Relation of this Conference. Truly, I knew of no reports then given out to the prejudice of the Jesuit's either person or cause. I was in a corner of the kingdom where I heard little. But howsoever, here is

a most plain confession by A. C. of that which he struggles to deny. He says, "he did not spread papers." What then? What? Why, he did but deliver copies. Why, but doth not he that delivers copies (for instance, of a libel) spread it? Yea, but he delivered but a very few copies. Be it so: I do not say how many he spread. He confesses the Jesuit delivered some, though very few; and he that delivers any spreads it abroad. For what can he tell, when the copies are once out of his power, how many may copy them out and spread them further? Yea, but he delivered them to special friends. Be it so too: the more special friends they were to him, the less indifferent would they be to me, perhaps my more special enemies. Yea, but all this was without an intent to calumniate me. Well, be that so too. But if I be calumniated

abroad papers of this conference, full enough of partiality to his cause, and more full of calumny against me. Hereupon I was in a manner forced to give Mr. Fisher's Relation of the Conference an answer, and to publish it. Though for some reasons, and those then approved by authority, it was thought fit I should set it out in my chaplain's name, R. B., and not in my own. To which I readily submitted.

There was a cause also, why at the first the discourse upon this conference stayed so long before it could endure to be pressed. For the conference was in May, 1622. And Mr. Fisher's paper was scattered and made common, so common, that a copy was brought to me (being none of his special friends), before Michaelmas. And yet this discourse was not printed till April, 1624. Now that you may know how this happened, I shall say for myself, it was not my idleness, nor my unwillingness to right both myself and the cause against the Jesuit and the paper which he had spread, that occasioned this delay. For I had then most honourable witnesses, and have some yet living, that this discourse (such as it was when A. C. nibbled at it) was finished long before I could persuade myself to let it come into public view. And this was caused partly by my own backwardness to deal with these men, whom I have ever observed to be great pretenders for truth and unity, but yet such as will admit neither, unless they and their faction may prevail in all, as if no reformation had been necessary; and partly because there were about the same time three conferences held with Fisher. Of these, this was the third; and could not therefore conveniently come abroad into the world, till the two former were ready to lead the way; which till that time they were not.

And this is in part the reason also, why this tract crept into the end of a larger work. For since that work contained in a manner the substance of all that passed in the two former conferences, and that this third in divers points concurred with them and depended on them; I could not think it substantive enough to stand alone. But besides this

thereby, his intention will not help it. And whether the copies which he delivered have not in them calumny against

me, I leave to the indifferent reader of this discourse to judge.



affinity between the conferences, I was willing to have it pass as silently as it might, at the end of another work, and so perhaps little to be looked after; because I could not hold it worthy, nor can I yet, of that great duty and service which I owe to my dear mother the church of England.

There is a cause also why it looks now abroad again with alteration and addition: and it is fit I should give your Majesty an account of that too. This tract was first printed in the year 1624. And in the year 1626, another Jesuit, or the same, under the name of A. C., printed a Relation of this conference, and therein took exceptions to some particulars, and endeavoured to confute some things delivered therein by me. Now being in years, and unwilling to die in the Jesuit's debt, I have in this second edition done as much for him, and somewhat more. For he did but skip up and down, and labour to pick a hole here and there, where he thought he might fasten; and where it was too hard for him, let it alone. But I have gone through with him, and I hope given a full confutation; or at least such a bone to gnaw, as may shake his teeth, if he look not to it. And of my addition to this discourse, this is the cause; but of my alteration of some things in it, this: A. C. his curiosity to winnow me made me in a more curious manner fall to sifting of myself, and that which had formerly passed my pen. And though (I bless God for it) I found no cause to alter any thing that belonged either to the substance or course of the conference, yet somewhat I did find which needed better and clearer expression; and that I have altered, well knowing I must expect curious observers on all hands.

Now, why this additional answer to the Relation of A. C. came no sooner forth, hath a cause too, and I shall truly represent it. A. C. his Relation of the Conference was set out 1626. I knew not of it in some years after. For it was printed among divers other things of like nature, either by Mr. Fisher himself, or his friend A. C. When I saw it, I read it over carefully, and found myself not a little wronged in it; but the church of England, and indeed the cause of religion, much more. I was before this time, by your Majesty's great grace and undeserved favour, made dean of your Majesty's chapel royal, and a counsellor of state, and



hereby, as the occasions of those times were, made too much a stranger to my books. Yet for all my busy employments, it was still in my thoughts to give A. C. an answer. But then I fell into a most dangerous fever; and though it pleased God, beyond all hope, to restore me to health, yet long I was before I recovered such strength as might enable me to undertake such a service. And since that time how I have been detained, and in a manner forced upon other many, various and great occasions, your Majesty knows best. And how of late I have been used by the scandalous and scurrilous pens of some bitter men, (whom I heartily beseech God to forgive,) the world knows: little leisure and less encouragement given me to answer a Jesuit, or set upon other services, while I am under the prophet's affliction, *'between the mouth that speaks wickedness, and the tongue that sets forth deceit,* and slander me as thick as if I were not their own mother's son. In the midst of these libellous outcries against me, some divines of great note and worth in the church came to me, one by one, and no one knowing of the other's coming, (as to me they protested,) and persuaded with me to reprint this Conference in my own name. This they thought would vindicate my reputation, were it generally known to be mine. I confess I looked round about these men and their motion; and at last, my thoughts working much upon themselves, I began to persuade myself that I had been too long diverted from this necessary work: and that perhaps there might be *in voce hominum tuba Dei*, in the still voice of men the loud trumpet of God, which sounds many ways, sometimes to the ears and sometimes to the hearts of men, and by means which they think not of. And as §St. Augustine speaks, a word of God there is, *quod nunquam tacet, sed non semper auditur*, which though it be never silent, yet is not always heard. That it is never silent, is his great mercy; and that it is not always heard, is not the least of our misery. Upon this motion I took time to deliberate; and had scarce time

f Psalm l. 19, 20.

g S. Aug. Serm. 63. de Diversis, c. 10. He speaks of Christ disputing in the temple with the elders of the Jews. And they heard Christ, the essential Word of the Father, with admiration to

astonishment, yet believed him not: Luke ii. 47. And the Word then spake to them by a means they thought not of, namely, *per Filium Dei in puero*, by the Son of God himself under the veil of our human nature.

for that, much less for the work. Yet at last to every of these men I gave this answer: That Mr. Fisher, or A. C. for him, had been busy with my former discourse, and that I would never reprint that, unless I might gain time enough to answer that which A. C. had charged afresh both upon me and the cause. While my thoughts were thus at work, your Majesty fell upon the same thing, and was graciously pleased not to command, but to wish me to reprint this Conference, and in mine own name; and this openly at the council-table in Michaelmas term, 1637. I did not hold it fit to deny, having in all the course of my service obeyed your Majesty's honourable and just motions as commands; but craved leave to shew what little leisure I had to do it, and what inconveniences might attend upon it. When this did not serve to excuse me, I humbly submitted to that, which I hope was God's motion in your Majesty's. And having thus laid all that concerns this discourse before your gracious and most sacred Majesty, I most humbly present you with the book itself, which as I heartily pray you to protect, so do I wholly submit it to the church of England, with my prayers for her prosperity, and my wishes that I were able to do her better service.

I have thus acquainted your Majesty with all occasions, which both formerly and now again have led this tract into the light; in all which I am a faithful relater of all passages, but am not very well satisfied who is now my adversary. Mr. Fisher was at the conference; since that, I find A. C. at the print. And whether these be two or but one Jesuit I know not, since scarce one amongst them goes under one name. But for my own part (and the error is not great, if I mistake) I think they are one, and that one, Mr. Fisher. That which induces me to think so is, first, the great inwardness of A. C. with Mr. Fisher, which is so great, as may well be thought to neighbour upon identity. Secondly, the style of A. C. is so like Mr. Fisher's, that I doubt it was but one  
 A. C. p. 67. and the same hand that moved the pen. Thirdly, A. C. says expressly, "That the Jesuit himself made the relation of the first conference with Dr. White:" and in the title-page of the work, that relation, as well as this, is said to be made by A. C. and published by W. I.; therefore A. C. and the Jesuit are

one and the same person, or else one of these places hath no truth in it.

Now if it be Mr. Fisher himself, under the name of A. C., then what needs these <sup>h</sup> words: "The Jesuit could be content to let pass the chaplain's censure, as one of his ordinary persecutions for the catholic faith; but A. C. thought it necessary for the common cause to defend the sincerity and truth of his Relation, and the truth of some of the chief heads contained in it?" In which speech give me leave to observe to your sacred Majesty, how grievously you suffer him and his fellows to be persecuted for the catholic faith, when your poor subject and servant cannot set out a true copy of a conference held with the Jesuit, *jussu superiorum*, but by and by the man is persecuted. God forbid I should ever offer to persuade a persecution in any kind, or practise it in the least; for to my remembrance, I have not given him or his so much as coarse language. But on the other side, God forbid too, that your Majesty should let both laws and discipline sleep for fear of the name of persecution, and in the mean time let Mr. Fisher and his fellows angle in all parts of your dominions for your subjects. If in your grace and goodness you will spare their persons, yet I humbly beseech you, see to it that they be not suffered to lay either their wheels, or bait their hooks, or cast their nets in every stream, lest that tentation grow both too general and too strong. I know they have many devices to work their ends; but if they will needs be fishing, let them use none but <sup>i</sup>lawful nets. Let us have no dissolving of oaths of allegiance, no deposing, no killing of kings, no blowing up of states, to settle *quod volumus*, that which fain they would have in the church; with many other nets as dangerous as these: for if their profession of religion were as good as they pretend it is, if they cannot compass it by good means, I am sure they ought not to attempt it by bad. For if they will *do evil that good may come* thereof, the apostle tells me, <sup>k</sup>*their damnation is just*.

Now as I would humbly beseech your Majesty to keep a

<sup>h</sup> Preface to the Relation of this Conference by A. C.

<sup>i</sup> And St. Augustine is very full against the use of *mala retia*, unlawful nets, and saith the fishermen themselves

have greatest cause to take heed of them. S. August. lib. de Fide et Oper. c. 17.

<sup>k</sup> Rom. iii. 8.

serious watch upon these Fisher-men, which pretend St. Peter, but fish not with his net; so would I not have you neglect another sort of anglers in a shallower water. For they have some ill nets too. And if they may spread them when and where they will, God knows what may become of it. These have not so strong a back abroad as the Romanists have; but that is no argument to suffer them to increase. They may grow to equal strength with number. And factious people at home, of what sect or fond opinion soever they be, are not to be neglected: partly, because they are so near; and it is ever a dangerous fire that begins in the bedstraw: and partly, because all those domestic evils, which threaten a rent in church or state, are with far more safety prevented by wisdom than punished by justice. And would men consider it right, they are far more beholding to that man that keeps them from falling, than to him that takes them up, though it be to set the arm or the leg that is broken in the fall.

In this discourse I have no aim to displease any, nor any hope to please all. If I can help on<sup>n</sup> to truth in the church, and the peace of the church together, I shall be glad, be it in any measure. Nor shall I spare to speak necessary truth, out of too much love of peace; nor thrust on unnecessary truth to the breach of that peace, which, once broken, is not so easily soldered again. And if for necessary truth's sake only, any man will be offended, nay take, nay snatch at that offence which is not given, I know no fence for that. It is truth, and I must tell it: it is the gospel, and I must preach it<sup>1</sup>. And far safer it is in this case to bear anger from men, than a woe from God. And where the foundations of faith are shaken, be it by superstition or profaneness, he that puts not to his hand as firmly as he can to support them, is too wary and hath more care of himself than of the cause of Christ. And it is a wariness that brings more danger in the end than it shuns. For the angel of the Lord issued out a curse against the inhabitants of Meroz, *because they came not to help the Lord, to help the Lord against the mighty<sup>m</sup>*. I know it is a great ease to let every thing be as it will, and every man believe and do

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 16.

<sup>m</sup> Judges v. 23.

as he list : but whether governors in state or church do their duty therewhile is easily seen, since this is an effect of no king in Israel <sup>n</sup>.

The church of Christ upon earth may be compared to a hive of bees, and that can be nowhere so steadily placed in this world, but it will be in some danger. And men that care neither for the hive nor the bees, have yet a great mind to the honey ; and having once tasted the sweet of the church's maintenance, swallow that for honey, which one day will be more bitter than gall in their bowels. Now the king and the priest, more than any other, are bound to look to the integrity of the church in doctrine and manners, and that in the first place ; for that is by far the best honey in the hive. But in the second place, they must be careful of the church's maintenance too, else the bees shall make honey for others, and have none left for their own necessary sustenance, and then all is lost. For we see it in daily and common use, that the honey is not taken from the bees, but they are destroyed first. Now in this great and busy work, the king and the priest must not fear to put their hands to the hive, though they be sure to be stung ; and stung by the bees whose hive and house they preserve. It was king David's case, (God grant it be never yours :) *They came about me*, saith the Psalmist, <sup>o</sup>*like bees*. This was hard usage enough, yet some profit, some honey might thus be gotten in the end : and that is the king's case. But when it comes to the priest, the case is altered : they come about him like wasps, or like hornets rather, all sting and no honey there. And all this many times for no offence, nay sometimes for service done them, would they see it. But you know who said, *Behold, I come shortly ; and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his works shall be* <sup>p</sup>. And he himself is so <sup>q</sup>*exceeding great a reward*, as that the manifold stings which are in the world, howsoever they smart here, are nothing when they are pressed out with that *exceeding weight of glory* which shall be revealed <sup>r</sup>.

<sup>n</sup> Judges xvii. 6.

<sup>o</sup> Psal. cxviii. 12.—Apum similitudine ardorem notat vesanum ; non est enim in illis multum roboris, sed mira excan-

descencia. Calv. in Psal. cxviii.

<sup>p</sup> Revel. xxii. 12.

<sup>q</sup> Gen. xv. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Rom. viii. 18.



Now one thing more let me be bold to observe to your Majesty in particular, concerning your great charge, the church of England. It is in a hard condition. She professes the ancient catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her of novelty in her doctrine. She practises church government, as it hath been in use in all ages and all places, where the church of Christ hath taken any rooting, both in and ever since the apostles' times; and yet the separatist condemns her for antichristianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two millstones; and unless your Majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable both dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable, that while both these press hard upon the church of England, both of them cry out upon persecution, like froward children, which scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet cry out all the while as if themselves were killed. Now to the Romanist I shall say this; The errors of the church of Rome are grown now (many of them) very old; and when errors are grown by age and continuance to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be far older, are ordinarily challenged for the bringers in of new opinions. And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, than that the reformation of an old corrupted church, will we, nill we, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs, Where was your church before Luther? for it was just there, where theirs is now. <sup>s</sup>One and the same church still, no doubt of that. One in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity; their part of the same church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still, but leprous with them, and cleansed with us; the same man still. And for the separatist, and him that lays

<sup>s</sup> "There is no other difference between us and Rome, than betwixt a church miserably corrupted, and happily purged," &c. Jos. Hall, bp. of Exon, in his Apologetical Advertisement to the Reader, p. 192; approved by Tho. Morton, bp. then of Coventry and Lich-

field, now of Duresm., in the letters printed by the bp. of Exeter, in this treatise called the Reconciler, p. 68. And Dr. Field, in this Appendix to the third part, cap. 2, where he cites Calvin to the same purpose, lib. iv. Inst. cap. 2. §. 11.

his grounds for separation or change of discipline, though all he says or can say be in truth of divinity and among learned men little better than ridiculous; yet since these fond opinions have gained some ground among your people, to such among them as are wilfully set to follow their blind guides through thick and thin, till †they fall into the ditch together, I shall say nothing: but for so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning, concerning them I shall say thus much only, “They are bells of passing good metal, and tuneable enough of themselves, and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are, by them which have gotten power in and over their consciences. And for this there is yet remedy enough; but how long there will be, I know not.

Much talking there is (bragging, your Majesty may call it) on both sides; and when they are in their ruff, they both exceed all moderation and truth too; so far, till both lips and pens open for all the world, like a purse without money; nothing comes out of this, and that which is worth nothing out of them. And yet this nothing is made so great, as if the salvation of souls, that great work of the Redeemer of the world the Son of God, could not be effected without it. And while the one faction cries up the church above the scripture, and the other the scripture to the neglect and contempt of the church, which the scripture itself teaches men both to honour and obey, they have so far endangered the belief of the one and the authority of the other, as that neither hath its due from a great part of men; whereas, according to Christ’s institution, the scripture, where it is plain, should guide the church, and the church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the scripture; yet so as neither the scripture should be forced, nor the church so bound up, as that upon just and further evidence she may not revise that which in any case hath slipt by her. What success this great distemper, caused by the collision of two such factions, may have, I know not, I cannot prophesy. This I know, that the use which wise men should make of other men’s falls is not to fall with them; and the use which pious and religious men

† Matth. xv. 14.

should make of these great flaws in Christianity, is not to join with them that make them, nor to help to dislocate those main bones in the body, which being once put out of joint will not easily be set again. And though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion gather strength, while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending for it. And while they thus contend, neither part consider that they are in a way to induce upon themselves and others that contrary extreme, which they seem most both to fear and oppose.

Besides, this I have ever observed, that many rigid professors have turned Roman catholics, and in that turn have been more jesuited than any other; and such Romanists as have changed from them have for the most part quite leaped over the mean, and been as rigid the other way as extremity itself. And this, if there be not both grace and wisdom to govern it, is a very natural motion; for a man is apt to think he can never run far enough from that which he once begins to hate, and doth not consider therewith, that where religion corrupted is the thing he hates, a fallacy may easily be put upon him; for he ought to hate the corruption which depraves religion, and to run from it; but from no part of religion itself, which he ought to love and reverence, ought he to depart. And this I have observed further, that no one thing hath made conscientious men more wavering in their own minds, or more apt and easy to be drawn aside from the sincerity of religion professed in the church of England, than the want of uniform and decent order in too many churches of the kingdom. And the Romanists have been apt to say, The houses of God could not be suffered to lie so nastily, (as in some places they have done,) were the true worship of God observed in them, or did the people think that such it were. It is true the inward worship of the heart is the great service of God, and no service acceptable without it; but the external worship of God in his church is the great witness to the world that our heart stands right in that service of God: take this away, or bring it into contempt, and what light is there left to shine before men, that they may see our devotion, and glorify our Father which is in heaven? And to deal clearly with your Majesty, these thoughts are they,



and no other, which have made me labour so much as I have done for decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the church; for of that which is inward there can be no witness among men, nor no example for men. Now no external action in the world can be uniform without some ceremonies; and these in religion, the ancients they be the better, so they may fit time and place: too many over-burden the service of God, and too few leave it naked. And scarce any thing hath hurt religion more in these broken times than an opinion in too many men, that because Rome had thrust some unnecessary and many superstitious ceremonies upon the church, therefore the Reformation must have none at all; not considering therewith, that ceremonies are the hedge that fence the substance of religion from all the indignities which profaneness and sacrilege too commonly put upon it. And a great weakness it is not to see the strength which ceremonies (things weak enough in themselves, God knows) add even to religion itself; but a far greater to see it, and yet to cry them down, all, and without choice, by which their most hated adversaries climbed up, and could not cry up themselves and their cause as they do but by them. And divines, of all the rest, might learn and teach this wisdom if they would, since they see all other professions which help to bear down their ceremonies, keep up their own therewith, and that to the highest.

I have been too bold to detain your Majesty so long; but my grief to see Christendom bleeding in dissension, and, which is worse, triumphing in her own blood, and most angry with them that would study her peace, hath thus transported me. For truly it cannot but grieve any man that hath bowels, to see all men seeking, but as St. Paul foretold<sup>u</sup>, their own things, and not the things which are Jesus Christ's; *sua*, their own surely, for the gospel of Christ hath nothing to do with them; and to see religion, so much, so zealously pretended and called upon, made but the stalking-horse to shoot at other fowl, upon which their aim is set: in the mean time, as if all were truth and holiness itself, no salvation must be possible, did it lie at their mercy, but in the communion of the

<sup>u</sup> Phil. ii. 21.

one, and in the conventicles of the other. As if either of these now were, as the Donatists of old reputed themselves, the only men in whom Christ at his coming to judgment should find faith. “No,” saith <sup>x</sup>St. Augustine, and so say I with him, “*Da veniam, non credimus*; pardon us, I pray, we cannot believe it.” The catholic church of Christ is neither Rome nor a conventicle. Out of that there is no salvation, I easily confess it; but out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too: salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave. In this ensuing discourse therefore I have endeavoured to lay open those wider gates of the catholic church, confined to no age, time, or place; nor knowing any bounds, but that *faith, which was once* (and but once for all) *delivered to the saints* <sup>y</sup>. And in my pursuit of this way I have searched after, and delivered with a single heart, that truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof, I have obeyed your Majesty, discharged my duty to my power to the church of England, <sup>z</sup>given account of the hope that is in me, and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and by God’s blessing and favour purpose to die; but till death shall most unfeignedly remain,

Your Majesty’s most faithful subject,

And most humble and obliged servant,

W. CANT.

<sup>x</sup> S. August. Epist. 48.

<sup>y</sup> Jude 3.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 15.

A

## RELATION OF THE CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

### WILLIAM LAUD,

THEN LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S, AFTERWARDS LORD ARCHBISHOP  
OF CANTERBURY,

AND

### MR. FISHER THE JESUIT.

¶. The occasion of this conference was—

33. **T**HE occasion of this third conference you should know Sect. 1.  
sufficiently. You were an actor in it, as well as in  
two other. Whether you have related the two former truly,  
appears by Dr. White the late reverend lord bishop of Ely  
his relation or exposition of them. I was present at none  
but this third; of which I here give the church an account.  
But of this third, whether that were the cause which you  
allege, I cannot tell. You say,

¶. It was observed, that in the second conference all the  
speech was about particular matters, little or none about  
a continual, infallible, visible church; which was the chief  
and only point in which a certain lady required satis-  
faction; as having formerly settled in her mind, that it  
was not for her, or any other unlearned persons, to take  
upon them to judge of particulars, without depending  
upon the judgment of the true church.

33. The opinion of that honourable person in this was never Sect. 2.  
opened to me. And it is very fit the people should look to  
the judgment of the church, before they be too busy with

Sect. 2, 3. particulars. But yet neither scripture<sup>a</sup>, nor any good authority, denies them some moderate use of their own understanding and judgment, especially in things familiar and evident; which even ordinary capacities may as easily understand as read<sup>b</sup>. And therefore some particulars a Christian may judge without depending.

¶ This lady therefore having heard it granted in the first conference, that there must be a continual visible company ever since Christ, teaching unchanged doctrine in all fundamental points, that is, points necessary to salvation, desired to hear this confirmed, and proof brought which was that continual, infallible, visible church, in which one may, and out of which one cannot, attain salvation. And therefore, having appointed a time of meeting between a B. and me, and thereupon having sent for the B. and me, before the B. came, the lady, and a friend of hers, came first to the room where I was, and debated before me the aforesaid question; and not doubting of the first part, to wit, that there must be a continual visible church, as they had heard granted by D. White and L. K., &c.

Sect. 3. I.—B. What D. White and L. K. granted, I heard not: but I think both granted a continual and a visible church; neither of them an infallible, at least in your sense. And yourself, in this relation, speak distractedly: for in these few lines from the beginning hither, twice you add *infallible* between *continual* and *visible*, and twice you leave it out. But this concerns D. W., and he hath answered it.

A. C. p. 42. II.—Here A. C. steps in, and says, “The Jesuit did not speak distractedly, but most advisedly: for (saith he) where he relates what D. White or L. K. granted, he leaves out the word *infallible*, because they granted it not; but where he speaks of the lady, there he adds it, because the Jesuit knew

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. x. 15.

<sup>b</sup> Quis non sine ullo magistro, aut interprete ex se facile cognoscat, &c. Novat. de Trin. c. 23.—Et loquitur de mysterio passionis Christi: Dijudicare est mensurare, &c.; unde et mens dicitur a metiendo. Thom. p. 1. q. 79. a 9 ad 4. To what end then is a mind and an understanding given a man, if he may not apply it to measure truth?—

Et διδασκία ἀπὸ τοῦ διανοεῖν, i. e. ab eo quod considerat, et discernit: quia discernit inter verum et falsum. Damasc. lib. ii. Fid. Orth. c. 22.

And A. C. himself, p. 41, denies not all judgment to private men; but says, “They are not so to rely absolutely upon their private judgment, as to adventure salvation upon it alone, or chiefly;” which no man will deny.

it was an infallible church which she sought to rely upon." Sect. 3. How far the catholic militant church of Christ is infallible, is no dispute for this place, though you shall find it after. But sure the Jesuit did not speak most advisedly, nor A. C. neither, nor the lady herself, if she said she desired to rely upon an infallible church. For an infallible church denotes a particular church, in that it is set in opposition to some other particular church that is not infallible. Now I for my part do not know what that lady desired to rely upon. This I know: if she desired such a particular church, neither this Jesuit, nor any other, is able to shew it her; no, not Bellarmine himself, though of very great ability to make good any truth which he undertakes for the church of Rome. <sup>c</sup>But no strength can uphold an error against truth, where truth hath an able defendant. Now where Bellarmine sets himself purposely to make this good, "<sup>d</sup>That the particular church of Rome cannot err in matter of faith;" out of which it follows, that there may be found a particular infallible church; you shall see what he is able to perform.

III.—1. First then, after he hath distinguished, to express his meaning, in what sense the particular church of Rome cannot err in things which are *de fide*, of the faith, he tells us, this firmitude is, because the see apostolic is fixed there. And this, he saith, is most true: <sup>e</sup>and for proof of it, he brings three Fathers to justify it.

(1.) The first, St. Cyprian, <sup>f</sup>whose words are, that the Romans are such as to whom *perfidia* cannot have access. Now *perfidia* can hardly stand for error in faith, or for misbelief; but it properly signifies malicious falsehood in matter of trust and action; not error in faith, but in fact, against the discipline and government of the church. And why may it not here have this meaning in St. Cyprian.

IV.—For the story there, it is this. <sup>g</sup>In the year 255 there was a council in Carthage in the cause of two schismatics,

<sup>c</sup> Veritas vincat necesse est, sive negantem, sive confitentem, &c. S. Aug. Epist. 174.—Occultari potest ad tempus veritas, vinci non potest. S. Aug. in Psal. 61.

<sup>d</sup> L. iv. de Rom. Pont. cap. 4. §. 1. Romana particularis ecclesia non potest errare in fide.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. §. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Navigare audent ad Petri cathedram, et ecclesiam principalem, &c. nec cogitare eos esse Romanos, ad quos perfidia habere non potest accessum. Cyprian. lib. i. epist. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Binnii Concil. tom. i. p. 152. edit. Paris. 1636. Baron. Anril. 253—255.

Sect. 3. Felicissimus and Novatian, about restoring of them to the communion of the church, which had lapsed, in time of danger, from Christianity to idolatry. Felicissimus would admit all, even without penance; and Novatian would admit none, no not after penance. The Fathers, forty-two in number, went, as the truth led them, between both extremes. To this council came Privatus, a known heretic, but was not admitted, because he was formerly excommunicated, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his complices together, and chooses one Fortunatus (who was formerly condemned as well as himself) bishop of Carthage, and set him up against St. Cyprian. This done, Felicissimus and his fellows haste to Rome, with letters testimonial from their own party, and pretend that twenty-five bishops concurred with them; and their desire was, to be received into the communion of the Roman church, and to have their new bishop acknowledged. Cornelius, then pope, though their haste had now prevented St. Cyprian's letters, having formerly heard from him both of them and their schism in Afric, would neither hear them, nor receive their letters. They grew insolent and furious, (the ordinary way that schismatics take.) Upon this Cornelius writes to St. Cyprian; and St. Cyprian, in this epistle, gives Cornelius thanks for refusing these African fugitives, declares their schism and wickedness at large, and encourages him, and all bishops, to maintain the ecclesiastical discipline and censures against any the boldest threatenings of wicked schismatics. This is the story; and in this is the passage here urged by Bellarmine. Now I would fain know why *perfidia* (all circumstances considered) may not stand here in its proper sense, for cunning and perfidious dealing; which these men, having practised at Carthage, thought now to obtrude upon the bishop of Rome also, but that he was wary enough not to be overreached by busy schismatics.

V.—(2.) Secondly, let it be granted, that *perfidia* doth signify here error in faith and doctrine. For I will not deny but that among the African writers (and especially St. Cyprian) it is sometimes so used; and therefore here perhaps. But then this privilege, of not erring dangerously in the faith, was not made over absolutely to the Romans, that are such by birth and dwelling only; but to the Romans, *qua tales*, as



they were such as those first were, *whose faith was famous* Sect. 3. *through the world*, and as long as they continued such; which at that time it seems they did. And so St. Cyprian's words seem to import, "eos esse Romanos," that the Romans then, under pope Cornelius, were such as the <sup>h</sup>apostle spake of; and therefore to whom, at that time, (or any time, they still remaining such,) perfidious misbelief could not be welcome; or rather, indeed, perfidious misbelievers or schismatics could not be welcome. For this very phrase, *perfidia non potest habere accessum*, directs us to understand the word in a concrete sense: "Perfidiousness could not get access;" that is, such perfidious persons, excommunicated out of other churches, were not likely to get access at Rome, or to find admittance into their communion. It is but a metonymy of speech, the adjunct for the subject; a thing very usual even in elegant authors, and much more in later times, as in St. Cyprian's, when the Latin language was grown rougher. Now, if it be thus understood (I say, in the concrete), then it is plain that St. Cyprian did not intend by these words to exempt the Romans from possibility of error, but to brand his adversaries with a title due to their merit, calling them perfidious, that is, such as had betrayed or perverted the faith. Neither can we lose by this construction, as will appear at after.

VI.—(3.) But thirdly; when all is done, what if it be no more than a rhetorical excess of speech; *perfidia non potest*, for *non facile potest*; it cannot, that is, it cannot easily? Or what if St. Cyprian do but *laudando precipere*, <sup>k</sup>by commending them to be such, instruct them that such indeed they ought to be, to whom perfidiousness should not get access? Men are very bountiful of their compliments sometimes. <sup>l</sup>Synesius writing to Theophilus of Alexandria begins thus: 'Εγὼ καὶ βούλομαι, καὶ ἀνάγκη μοι θεία, &c. I both will, and a divine necessity lies upon me, to esteem it a law, whatsoever that throne (meaning his of Alexandria) shall determine. Nay, the word is *θεσπίζω*, and that signifies to determine like an oracle, or as in God's stead. Now I hope you will say, this is not to be

<sup>h</sup> Rom. i. 8.

<sup>i</sup> Ego tibi istam scelestam, *scelus*, linguam abscondam. Plaut. Amphit.—  
Ex hac enim parte pudor pugnat, illinc *petulantia*, &c. Cic.—Latuit plebeio tec-

tus amictu omnis *Honos*. Nullo comitata est purpura *fusces*. Lucan. lib. ii.

<sup>k</sup> Nec cogitare eos esse Romanos, quorum fides apostolo predicante, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Epist. 67.

Sect. 3. taken dogmatically, it is but the epistler's courtesy only. And why not the like here? For the haste which these schismatics made to Rome prevented St. Cyprian's letters: yet Cornelius, very careful of both the truth and peace of the church, would neither hear them, nor receive their letters, <sup>m</sup>till he had written to St. Cyprian. Now this epistle is St. Cyprian's answer to Cornelius, in which he informs him of the whole truth; and withal gives him thanks for refusing to hear these African fugitives. In which fair way of returning his thanks, if he make an honourable mention of the Romans and their faith, with a little dash of rhetoric, even to a *non potest*, for a *non facile potest*, it is no great wonder.

VII.—But take which answer you will of the three, this is plain, that St. Cyprian had no meaning to assert the unerring infallibility of either pope or church of Rome. For this is more than manifest, by the contestation which after happened between St. Cyprian and pope Stephen, about the rebaptization of those that were baptized by heretics; for <sup>u</sup>he saith expressly, that “pope Stephen did then not only maintain an error, but the very cause of heretics; and that against Christians and the very church of God.” <sup>o</sup>And after this he chargeth him with obstinacy and presumption. I hope this is plain enough to shew, that St. Cyprian had no great opinion of the Roman infallibility: or if he had it when he writ to Cornelius, certainly he had changed it when he wrote against Stephen. But I think it was no change; and that when he wrote to Cornelius, it was rhetoric, and no more.

VIII.—Now if any man shall say that, in this point of rebaptization, St. Cyprian himself was in the wrong opinion, and pope Stephen in the right, I easily grant that; but yet that error of his takes not off his judgment, what he thought of the papal or Roman infallibility in those times. For though

<sup>m</sup> For so St. Cyprian begins his epistle to Cornelius; *Legi literas tuas, frater, &c.* And after: *Sed enim lecta alia epistola tua, frater, &c.* S. Cyprian. lib. i. epist. 3.

<sup>n</sup> *Stephanus frater noster hæreticorum causam contra Christianos, et contra ecclesiam Dei asserere conatur.* Cypri.

*ad Pompeium contra Epist. Stephani* edit. per Erasmum, Basil. p. 327.

<sup>o</sup> *Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura.* Ibid. p. 329. And it would be marked by the Jesuit and his A. C. that still it is *Stephani fratris nostri*, and not *capitis*, or *summi pastoris nostri*.



afterwards St. Cyprian's opinion was condemned in a council Sect. 3. at Rome under Cornelius, and after that by pope Stephen, and after both, in the first council of Carthage; yet no one word is there in that council which mentions this as an error, that he thought pope Stephen might err in the faith, while he proclaimed he did so. In which, though the particular censure which he passed on pope Stephen was erroneous, (for Stephen erred not in that,) yet the general which results from it (namely, that for all his being in the popedom, he might err) is most true.

IX.—2. The second Father which Bellarmine cites is St. Jerome: his words are, “The Roman faith, commended by the apostle, admits not such *præstigiæ*, deceits, and delusions into it, though an angel should preach it otherwise than it was preached at first, (and) being armed and fenced by St. Paul's authority, cannot be changed.” Where, first, I will not doubt but that St. Jerome speaks here of the faith; for the *præstigiæ* here mentioned are afterwards more plainly expressed; for he tells us after, “That the bishop of Rome had sent letters into the East, and charged heresy upon Rufinus:” and further, “that Origen's books *περὶ ἀρχῶν* were translated by him, and delivered to the simple people of the church of Rome, that by his means they might lose the verity of the faith which they had learned from the apostle.” Therefore the *præstigiæ* before-mentioned were the cunning illusions of Rufinus, putting Origen's book under the martyr Pamphilus his name, that so he might bring in heresy the more cunningly under a name of credit, and the more easily pervert the people's faith. So, of the faith he speaks. And secondly, I shall as easily confess, that St. Jerome's speech is most true, but I cannot admit the cardinal's sense of it; for he imposes upon the word *fides*: for by *Romana fides*, “the Roman faith,”

p Caranza in Concil. Carthag. sub Cornel. fine.

q Can. 1

r Attamen scito Romanam fidem apostolica voce laudatam ejusmodi præstigiæ non recipere, etiamsi angelus aliter annunciet, quam semel prædicatum est, Pauli autoritate munitam non posse mutari. S. Hieron. lib. iii. Apol. contra Rufinum, tom. ii. edit. Paris. 1534. fol. 84. K. Peradventure it is here to

be read *et jam si*, for so the place is more plain, and more strong; but the answer is the same.

s Deinde ut epistolas contra te ad Orientem mitteret, et cauterium tibi hæreseos inureret. Diceretque libros Origenis *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, a te translatos, et simplici ecclesie Romanae plebi traditos, ut fidei veritatem quam ab apostolo didicerant, per te perderent. S. Hieron. ibid. fol. 85. K.

Sect. 3. he will understand the particular church of Rome; which is as much as to say, *Romanos fideles*, the faithful of that church; and that no wily delusions, or cozenage in matter of faith, can be imposed upon them. Now hereupon I return to that of St. Cyprian: if *fides Romana* must signify *fideles Romanos*, why may not *perfidia* before signify *perfidios*? especially since these two words are commonly used by these writers, as terms 'opposite; and therefore, by the law of opposition, may interpret each other proportionably. So with these great masters, with whom it is almost grown to be, *quod volumus, rectum est*, what we please shall be the author's meaning, *perfidia* must signify absolutely error in faith, or misbelief; but *fides* must relate to the persons, and signify the faithful of the Roman church. And now I conceive my answer will proceed with a great deal of reason. For *Romana fides*, "the Roman faith," as it was commended by the apostle, (of which St. Jerome speaks,) is one thing, and the particular Roman church, of which the cardinal speaks, is another. The faith, indeed, admits not *præstigias*, wily delusions, into it; if it did, it could not be the *whole and undefiled faith of Christ*, which they learned from the apostle, and which is so fenced by apostolical authority, as that it cannot be changed, though an angel should preach the contrary. But the particular church of Rome hath admitted *præstigias*, divers crafty conveyances, into the faith, and is not fenced, as the faith itself is: and therefore, though an angel cannot contrary that, yet the bad angel hath sowed tares in this. By which means *Romana fides*, though it be now the same it was for the words of the Creed, yet it is not the same for the sense of it; nor for the super and præter-structures built upon it, or joined unto it. So the Roman faith, that is, the faith which St. Paul taught the Romans, and after commended in them, was all one with the catholic faith of Christ. For St. Paul taught no other than that one; and this one can never be changed in or from itself by angel or devil. But in men's hearts it may receive a change; and in particular churches

t Qui cum fidei dux esse non potuit, perfidie existat. S. Cyprian. lib. i. epist. 7.—Fidem perfidi, &c. Ibid.—Facti sunt ex ovibus vulpes, ex fidelibus perfidi. Optatus, lib. vii.—Quomodo iis prosit quum baptizantur parentum fides, quo-

rum iis non potest obesse perfidia? S. Aug. epist. 23.—Quanto potius fides aliena potest consulere parvulo, cui sua perfidia, &c. S. Aug. lib. iii. de Lib. Arbit. c. 23.

it may receive a change; and in the particular church of Sect. 3. Rome it hath received a change. And ye see St. Jerome himself confesses that the pope himself was afraid *ne perderent*, lest by this art of Ruffinus the people might lose the verity of the faith. Now that which can be lost can be changed: for usually habits begin to alter before they be quite lost. And that which may be lost among the people may be lost among the bishops, and the rest of the clergy too, if they look not to it; as it seems they after did not at Rome, though then they did. Nay, at this time the whole Roman church was in danger enough to swallow Origen's book, and all the errors in it, coming under the name of Pamphilus: and so St. Jerome himself expressly, and close upon the place cited by Bellarmine. For he desires <sup>x</sup> Ruffinus to change the title of the book, (that error may not be spread under the specious name of Pamphilus,) and so to free from danger the Roman simplicity: where, by the way, Roman unerring power now challenged, and Roman simplicity then feared, agree not very well together.

X.—3. The third Father alleged by Bellarmine is <sup>y</sup> St. Gregory Nazianzen. And his words are: "That ancient Rome from of old hath the right faith, and always holds it, as becomes the city which is governess over the whole world, to have an entire faith in and concerning God." Now certainly it became that city very well to keep the faith sound and entire. And having the government of great part of the world then in her power, it became her so much the more, as her example thereby was the greater. And in St. Gregory Nazianzen's time Rome did certainly hold both *rectam et integram fidem*, the right and the whole entire faith of Christ. But there is nor promise nor prophecy in St. Gregory that Rome shall ever so do. For his words are plain; *deceat semper*, it becomes that great city always to have, and to hold too, *integram fidem*, the entire faith. But at the other

<sup>u</sup> Ne fidei veritatem, quam ab apostolo didicerant, per te perderent; ut supra.

<sup>x</sup> Muta titulum, et Romanam simplicitatem tanto periculo libera. Ibid. fol. 84. K.

<sup>y</sup> Vetus Roma ab antiquis temporibus

habet rectam fidem, et semper eam retinet, sicut deceat urbem, quæ toti orbi præsidet, semper de Deo integram fidem habere. Greg. Naz. in Carmine de vita sua; ante medium, p. 9. edit. Paris. 1609.

Sect. 3. *semper*, it is <sup>z</sup>*retinet*; that city from of old holds the right faith yet: but he saith not, *retinebit semper*, that the city of Rome shall retain it ever, no more than it shall ever retain the empire of the world. Now it must be assured, that it shall ever hold the entire faith of Christ, before we can be assured that that particular church can never err, or be infallible.

XI.—Besides these, the cardinal names Cyrillus and Rufinus; but he neither tells us where, nor cites their words. Yet I think I have found the most pregnant place in <sup>a</sup>St. Cyril, and that makes clearly against him. For I find expressly these three things. First, that the church is inexpugnable, and that *the gates of hell shall never prevail against it*; but that it shall *in perpetuum manere*, remain for ever. And this all protestants grant. But this, that it shall not fall away, doth not secure it from all kinds of error. Secondly, Bellarmine quotes St. Cyril for the particular Roman church; and St. Cyril speaks not of the Roman at all, but of the church of Christ, that is, the catholic church. Thirdly, that the foundation and firmness which the church of Christ hath, is placed not *in* or *upon* the <sup>b</sup>person, much less the successor of St. Peter; but upon the <sup>c</sup>faith which, by God's Spirit in him, he so firmly professed: which is the common received opinion both of the ancient Fathers and the protestants. *Upon this rock*, that is, upon this faith, *will I build my church* <sup>d</sup>. So here is all the good he hath gotten by St. Cyril, unless he can cite some other place of St. Cyril, which I believe he cannot.

XII.—And for Rufinus, the place which Bellarmine aims at is in his Exposition upon the Creed, and is quoted in part

<sup>z</sup> The words in the Greek are, ἡ μὲν ἦν ἐκ πλεόνος, καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἔστιν εὐδρομος. Hæc quidem fuit diu, et nunc adhuc est rectigrada. Ἔστιν, est; so St. Gregory says; but of an ἔσται, or a *retinebit*, he says nothing: nor is *semper* in the text of Nazianzen.

<sup>a</sup> Petram opinor per agnominacionem nihil aliud, quam incoeuissam et firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit. In qua, ecclesia Christi ita fundata et firmata esset, ut non laberetur, et esset inexpugnabilis inferorum portis, in perpe-

tuum manens. S. Cyril. Alexand. Dial. de Trin. lib. iv. p. 278. Parisiis, an. 1604.

<sup>b</sup> *Et ego dico tibi*] i. e. tuæ confessioni, qua mihi dixisti, *Tu es Christus*, &c. Dion. Carthus. in S. Matt. xvi. 18.

<sup>c</sup> *Et super hanc Petram*] i. e. fidei hujus firmitatem et fundamentum. Vel super hanc Petram quam confessus es, i. e. super Meipsum lapidem angularem, &c. Ibid.

<sup>d</sup> Matt. xvi. 18.

the chapter before. But when all his words shall be laid together, they will make no more for Bellarmine and his cause than the former places have done. †Rufinus his words then run thus: “Before I come to the words of the Creed, this I think fit to warn you of, that in divers churches some things are found added to the words (of the Creed). But in the church of the city of Rome this is not found done: and, as I think, it is, for that no heresy did take its rise or beginning there; and for that the old custom is there observed, namely, that they which are to receive the grace of baptism do publicly repeat the Creed in the hearing of the people, who would not admit such additions. But in other places, (as far as I can understand,) by reason of some heretics, some things were added, but such as were to exclude the sense of their novel doctrine.” Now these words make little for Bellarmine, who cites them, and much against Rufinus that uttered them. They make little for Bellarmine. First, because suppose Rufinus his speech to be true, yet this will never follow. In Rufinus his time no heresy had taken its beginning at Rome: therefore no heresy hath had rooting there so many hundred years since. Secondly, Bellarmine takes upon him there to prove that the particular church of Rome cannot err. Now neither can this be concluded out of Rufinus his words. First, because (as I said before) to argue from *non sumpsit* to *ergo sumere non potest*, no heresy hath yet begun there, therefore none can begin there, or spring thence, is an argument drawn *ab actu ad potentiam negative*, from the act to the power of being; which every novice in learning can tell proceeds not negatively. And common reason tells every man it is no consequence to say, Such a thing is not, or hath not been, therefore it cannot be. Secondly, because though it were true that no heresy at all did ever take its beginning

c Bellar. lib. iv. de Rom. Pont. cap. 3. §. penult.

† Illud non importane commen-  
dum puto, quod in diversis ecclesiis ali-  
qua in his verbis inveniuntur adjecta.  
In ecclesia tamen urbis Romæ hoc non  
deprehenditur factum. Pro eo arbitror,  
quod neque hæresis ulla illic sumpsit  
exordium, et mos ibi servatur antiquus,  
eos qui gratiam baptismi suscepturi  
sunt, publico, id est, fidelium populo

audiente, symbolum reddere: et utique  
adjectionem unius saltem sermonis, eo-  
rum qui præcesserunt in fide, non ad-  
mittit auditis. In cæteris autem locis,  
quantum intelligi datur, propter non-  
nullos hæreticos addita quedam viden-  
tur, per quæ novellæ doctrinæ sensus  
credetur excludi, &c. Rufin. in Ex-  
posit. Symbol. (ut habetur inter Opera  
S. Cypriani) Præfat. Expos.



Sect. 3. at Rome, yet that can never prove that the particular church of Rome can never err, (which is the thing in question.) For suppose that no heresy did ever begin there, yet if any that began elsewhere were admitted into that church, it is as full a proof that that church can err, as if the heresy had been hatched into that nest. For that church errs which admits an heresy in it, as well as that which broaches it. Now Rufinus says no more of the Roman church than *non sumpsit exordium*, no heresy took its beginning there; but that denies not but that some heretical taint might get in there: and it is more than manifest that the most famous heresies, in their several times, made their abode even at Rome. And it is observable too that Bellarmine cites no more of Rufinus his words than these, “*In ecclesia urbis Romæ neque hæresis ulla sumpsit exordium, et mos ibi servatur antiquus,*” as if this were an entire speech, whereas it comes in but as a reason given of the speech precedent; and as if Rufinus made the church of Rome the great observer of the customs of the church, whereas he speaks but of one particular custom of reciting the Creed before baptism. But after all this, I pray, did no heresy ever begin at Rome? Where did Novatianism begin? At Rome sure. For <sup>f</sup> Baronius, <sup>g</sup> Pamelius, and <sup>h</sup> Petavius, do all dispute the point, whether that sect was denominated from Novatianus, the Roman priest, or Novatus, the African bishop; and they conclude for Novatian. He then that gave that name is in all right the founder, and Rome the nest of that heresy; and there it continued with a succession of <sup>i</sup> bishops from Cornelius to Coelestine, which is near upon two hundred years. Nay, could Rufinus himself be ignorant that some heresy began at Rome? No sure. For in this I must challenge him either for his weak memory or his wilful error. For Rufinus had not only read Eusebius his history, but had been at the pains to translate him. Now <sup>k</sup> Eusebius says plainly, that some heretics spread their venom in Asia, some

<sup>f</sup> Baron. tom. ii. an. 254. num. 62.

<sup>g</sup> Pamel. in Cyprian. Epist. 41. et 73.

<sup>h</sup> Petavius in Epiphaniæ Hæres. 59.

<sup>i</sup> Onuph. in Notis ad Plat. in Vita Cornelii.

<sup>k</sup> Hæretici alii in morem venenatorum serpentium in Asiam et Phrygiam irreperunt, οἱ δ' ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἤκμαζον,

quorum dux Florinus. Euseb. lib. v. cap. 14. And in Rufinus his translation, c. 15. And then afterwards, c. 19 and 20: ἐξεναντίας δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τὸν ὑγιῆ τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεσμῶν παραχαρᾶτόντων, &c. Now these taught that God

was the author of sin.

in Phrygia, and others grew at Rome; and Florinus was the Sect. 3. ringleader of them. And more clearly after. "Irenæus," saith he, "directed divers epistles against this Florinus, and his fellow Blastus, and condemns them of such heresies as threw them and their followers into great impiety, &c.; those at Rome corrupting the sound doctrine of the church." Therefore most manifest it is that some heresy had its rise and beginning at Rome. But to leave this slip of Rufinus: most evident it is that Rufinus neither did nor could account the particular church of Rome infallible; for if he had esteemed so of it, he would not have dissented from it in so main a point, as is the canon of the scripture, as he plainly doth. <sup>l</sup>For reckoning up the canonical books, he most manifestly dissents from the Roman church. Therefore either Rufinus did not think the church of Rome was infallible, or else the church of Rome at this day reckons up more books within the canon than heretofore she did. If she do, then she is changed in a main point of faith, the canon of scripture, and is absolutely convinced not to be infallible: for if she were right in her reckoning then, she is wrong now; and if she be right now, she was wrong then: and if she do not reckon more now than she did when Rufinus lived, then he reckons fewer than she, and so dissents from her; which doubtless he durst not have done, had he thought her judgment infallible. Yea, and he sets this mark upon his dissent besides, "<sup>m</sup>that he reckons up the books of the canon just so, and no otherwise, than as he received them out of the monuments of the forefathers; and out of which the assertions of our faith are to be taken." Last of all: had this place of Rufinus any strength for the infallibility of the church of Rome, yet there is very little reason that the pope and his clergy should take any benefit by it. For <sup>n</sup>St. Jerome tells us, "that when

<sup>l</sup> Ruf. in Exposit. Symb. p. 188. In which reckoning he plainly agrees with the church of England, Art. VI.

<sup>m</sup> Novi et Veteris Testamenti volumina, &c. sicut ex Patrum monumentis accepimus. Ruf. in Symb. p. 188. Et hæc sunt quæ Patres intra canonem concluderunt. Et ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt. Ibid. p. 189.

<sup>n</sup> Si episcopi Romani est, stulte facis

ab eo exemplar epistolæ petere, cui missa non est, &c. Vade potius Romanam, et præsens apud eum expostula, cur tibi et absenti et innocenti fecerit injuriam. Primum, ut non reciperet expositionem fidei tuæ, quam omnis (ut scribis) Italia comprobavit, &c. Deinde, ut cauterium tibi hæreseos, dum nescis, inureret. S. Hieron. Apol. 3. advers. Rufin. fol. 85. K.



Sect. 3.

Rufinus was angry with him for an epistle which he writ not, he plainly sent him to the bishop of Rome, and bid him expostulate with him for the contumely put upon him, in that he received not his exposition of the faith, which (said he) all Italy approved: and in that he branded him also, *dum nesciret*, (behind his back,) with heresy." Now if the pope which then was rejected this exposition of the Creed made by Rufinus, and branded him besides with heresy, his sentence against Rufinus was just or unjust: if unjust, then the pope erred about a matter of faith; and so neither he, nor the church of Rome, infallible: if just, then the church of Rome labours to defend herself by his pen, which is judged heretical by herself. So, whether it were just or unjust, the church of Rome is driven to a hard strait, when she must beg help of him whom she branded with heresy, and out of that tract which she herself rejected; and so uphold her infallibility by the judgment of a man, who, in her judgment, had erred so foully: nor may she by any <sup>u</sup>law take benefit of a testimony which herself hath defamed and protested against.

XIII.—With these Bellarmine is pleased to name six or <sup>o</sup> seven popes, which, he saith, are all of this opinion. But of popes' opinions he saith, that <sup>p</sup> "these testimonies will be contemned by the heretics." Good words, I pray. I know whom the cardinal means by heretics very well; but the best is, his call cannot make them so. Nor shall I easily condemn seven ancient bishops of Rome concurring in opinion, if apparent verity in the thing itself do not force me to dissent; and in that case I shall do it without contempt too. This only I will say, <sup>q</sup> that seven popes concurring in opinion shall have less weight with me in their own cause than any other seven of the more ancient Fathers. Indeed, could I swallow <sup>r</sup>Bellarmino's opinion, that the pope's judgment is infallible, I would then submit without any more ado. But that will never

<sup>n</sup> Quam quis se velle personas testium post publicationem repellere fuerit protestatus; si quid pro ipso dixerint, iis non creditur. Extra. Tex. et ibi Gloss. c. Presentium 31. de Testibus.

<sup>o</sup> Lib. iv. c. 3. §. De altero ergo.

<sup>p</sup> Quæ etsi ab hæreticis contemnentur. Lib. iv. c. 4 §. Addo etiam.

<sup>q</sup> Nemini in sua causa credendum,

nisi conformiter ad legem divinam, naturalem et canonicam loquatur. So Jo. Gerson, and the docters of Paris, cited in Lib. Anon. de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate, c. 16. ed. Paris. 1612. Now these popes do not speak here conformably to these laws.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. iv. de Rom. Pont. c. 3. in initio.

down with me, unless I live till I dote, which I hope in God Sect. 3. I shall not.

XIV.—Other proofs than these Bellarmine brings not, to prove that the particular church of Rome cannot err in or from the faith. And of what force these are to sway any judgment, I submit to all indifferent readers. And having thus examined Bellarmine's proofs, that the particular church of Rome cannot err in faith, I now return to A. C. and the Jesuit; and tell them, that no Jesuit, or any other, is ever able to prove any particular church infallible. A. C. p. 42.

XV.—But for the particular church of Rome, and the pope with it, erred it hath, and therefore may err: erred, I say, it hath, in the worship of images, and in altering Christ's institution in the blessed sacrament, by taking away the cup from the people; and divers other particulars, as shall appear at <sup>s</sup> after. And as for the ground which is presumed to secure this church from error, it is very remarkable how the <sup>t</sup> learned cardinal speaks in this case; for he tells us, that this proposition, "So long as St. Peter's chair is at Rome, that particular church cannot err in the faith," is *verissima*, most true; and yet in the very next words it is *fortasse tam vera*, peradventure as true as the former, that is, "That the pope, when he teaches the whole church in those things which belong to the faith, cannot err in any case." What! Is that proposition most true? and yet is it but at a peradventure it is as true as this? Is it possible any thing should be absolutely most true, and yet under a peradventure that it is but as true as another truth? But here, without all peradventure, neither proposition is true. And then indeed Bellarmine may say, without a *fortasse*, that this proposition, "The particular church of Rome cannot err, so long as the see apostolic is there," is as true as this; "The pope cannot err while he teaches the whole church in those things which belong to the faith:" for neither of them is true. But he cannot say that either of them is *verissima*, most true, when neither of them hath truth.

<sup>s</sup> §. 33. Consid. 7. Num. 5. et 12.

<sup>t</sup> Romana ecclesia particularis non potest errare, persistente Romæ apostolica sede. Propositio hæc est verissima, et fortasse tam vera quam illa prima de pontifice. Lib. iv. de Rom. Pont.

c. 4. §. 2. edit. Lugdun. 1596. And that first proposition is this: Summus pontifex, cum totam ecclesiam docet, in his quæ ad fidem pertinent nullo casu errare potest. Ibid. c. 3. §. 1.

Sect. 3.

XVI.—2. Secondly, if the particular church of Rome be infallible, and can neither err in the faith, nor fall from it, then it is because the see apostolic cannot be transferred from Rome, but must ever, to the consummation of the world, remain there, and keep that particular church from erring. Now to this what says Bellarmine? What! why he tells us, "that it is a pious and most probable opinion to think so. And he reckons four probabilities that it shall never be removed from Rome. And I will not deny but some of them are fair probabilities; but yet they are but probabilities, and so unable to convince any man. Why but then, what if a man cannot think as Bellarmine doth, but that, enforced by the light of his understanding, he must think the quite contrary to this which Bellarmine thinks pious, and so probable? What then? Why then <sup>x</sup>Bellarmino himself tells you, that the quite contrary proposition to this, namely, that "St. Peter's chair may be severed from Rome, and that then that particular church may err, is neither heretical nor manifestly erroneous." So then, by Bellarmine's own confession, I am no heretic, nor in any manifest error, if I say (as indeed I do, and think it too) that it is possible for St. Peter's chair to be carried from Rome, and that then at least, by his own argument, that church may err.

XVII.—Now then, upon the whole matter, and to return  
A. C. p. 42. to A. C. If that lady desired to rely upon a particular infallible church, it is not to be found on earth. Rome hath not that gift, nor her bishop neither. And Bellarmine (who I think was as able as any champion that church hath) dares not say it is either heresy or a manifest error to say, that the apostolic see may be removed thence, and that church not only err in faith, but also fall quite away from it. Now I, for my part, have not ignorance enough in me to believe that that church, which may apostatize at some one time, may not err at another; especially since both her erring and failing may arise from other causes besides that which is mentioned by the cardinal. And if it may err, it is not infallible.

<sup>u</sup> Pia et probabilissima sententia est, cathedram Petri non posse separari a Roma, et proinde Romanam ecclesiam absolute non posse errare, vel deficere. Lib. iv. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. §. Quod

nilominus.

<sup>x</sup> Contraria sententia nec est hæretica, nec manifeste erronea. Lib. iv. de Rom. Pont. c. 4. §. At secundum.

Ɔ. The question was, Which was that church? A friend of Sect. 3-5. the lady's would needs defend, that not only the Roman, but also the Greek church was right.

33. When that honourable personage answered, I was not Sect. 4. by to hear. But I presume he was so far from granting that only the Roman church was right, as that he did not grant it right; and that he took on him no other defence of the poor Greek church than was according to truth.

Ɔ. I told him that the Greek church had plainly changed, and taught false in a point of doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost; and that I had heard say, that even his majesty should say that the Greek church having erred against the Holy Ghost had lost the Holy Ghost.

34. You are very bold with his majesty, to relate him upon Sect. 5. hearsay. My intelligence serves me not to tell you what his majesty said: but if he said it not, you have been too credulous to believe and too sudden to report it. Princes deserve, and were wont to have, more respect than so. If his majesty did say it, there is truth in the speech; the error is yours only, by mistaking what is meant by *losing the Holy Ghost*. For a particular church may be said to lose the Holy Ghost two ways, or in two degrees. 1. The one, when it loses such special assistance of that blessed Spirit, as preserves it from all dangerous errors and sins, and the temporal punishment which is due unto them: and in this sense the Greek church did perhaps lose the Holy Ghost; for they erred against him, they sinned against God. And for this, or other sins, they were delivered into another Babylonish captivity under the Turk; in which they yet are, and from which God in his mercy deliver them. But this is rather to be called an error *circa Spiritum Sanctum*, about the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, than an error against the Holy Ghost. 2. The other is, when it loses not only this assistance, but all assistance *ad hoc*, to this, that they may remain any longer a true church; and so Corinth and Ephesus, and divers other churches, have lost the Holy Ghost: but in this sense the whole Greek church lost not the Holy Ghost; for they continue a true church, in the main substance, to and at this day,

Sect. 5-7. though erroneous in this point which you mention, and perhaps in some other too.

Ɔ. The lady's friend, not knowing what to answer, called in the bishop, who sitting down first excused himself as one unprovided, and not much studied in controversies; and desiring that in case he should fail, yet the protestant cause might not be thought ill of—

Sect. 6. Ɔ. This is most true: for I did indeed excuse myself, and I had great reason so to do. And my reason being grounded upon modesty, for the most part, there I leave it. Yet this it may be fit others should know, that I had no information where the other conferences brake off; no instruction at all what should be the ground of this third conference, nor the full time of four and twenty hours to bethink myself. And this I take upon my credit is most true: whereas you make the sifting of these and the like questions to the very bran, your daily work, and came throughly furnished to the business, and might so lead on the controversy to what yourself pleased, and I was to follow as I could. y St. Augustine said once, *Scio me invalidum esse*, I know I am weak; and yet he made good his cause: and so perhaps may I against you. And in that I preferred the cause before my particular credit, that which I did was with modesty, and according to reason. For there is no reason the weight of this whole cause should rest upon any one particuar man; and great reason that the personal defects of any man should press himself, but not the cause. Neither did I enter upon this service out of any forwardness of my own, but commanded to it by supreme authority.

Ɔ. It having an hundred better scholars to maintain it than he. To which I said, there were a thousand better scholars than I to maintain the catholic cause.

Ɔ. In this I had never so poor a conceit of the protestants' cause, as to think that they had but an hundred better than myself to maintain it. That which hath an hundred may have as many more as it pleases God to give and more than



you. And I shall ever be glad that the church of England Sect. 7-9. (which, at this time, if my memory reflect not amiss, I named) may have far more able defendants than myself. I shall never envy them, but rejoice for her. And I make no question, but that if I had named a thousand, you would have multiplied yours into ten thousand for the catholic cause (as you call it). And this confidence of yours hath ever been fuller of noise than proof. But you proceed.

Ɔ. Then the question about the Greek church being proposed, I said as before, that it had erred.

Ɔ. Then I think the question about the Greek church was Sect. 8. proposed. But after you had with confidence enough not spared to say, that what I would not acknowledge in this cause, you would wring and extort from me; then indeed you said as before, that it had erred: and this no man denied. But every error denies not Christ, the foundation; or makes Christ deny it, or thrust it from the foundation.

Ɔ. The bishop said, that the error was not in points fundamental.

Ɔ. I.—I was not so peremptory. My speech was, that divers Sect. 9. learned men, and some of your own, were of opinion, that (as the Greeks expressed themselves) it was a question not simply fundamental. I know and acknowledge that error, of denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, to be a grievous error in divinity. And sure it would have grated the foundation, if they had so denied the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, as that they had made an inequality between the persons. But since their form of speech is, “z that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son, and is the Spirit of the Son,” without making any difference in the consubstantiality of the persons, I dare not deny them to be a true church for this; though I confess them an erroneous church in this particular.

II.—Now that divers learned men were of opinion, that *a Filio* and *per Filium* in the sense of the Greek church was but a question *in modo loquendi*, in manner of speech,

z Non ex Filio, sed Spiritum Filii esse dicimus. Damascen. lib. 1. Fid. Orth. c. 11. Et Patris per Filium. *ibid.*

Sect. 9. <sup>a</sup>and therefore not fundamental, is evident. <sup>b</sup>The master and his scholars agree upon it. “The Greeks,” saith he, “confess the Holy Ghost to be the Spirit of the Son, with the apostle, Galat. iv., and *the Spirit of truth*, St. John xvi. And since *non est aliud*, it is not another thing to say, the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, than that he is or proceeds from the Father and the Son; in this they seem to agree with us in *eandem fidei sententiam*, upon the same sentence of faith, though they differ in words.” Now in this cause, where the words differ but the sentence of faith is the same, <sup>c</sup>*penitus eadem*, even altogether the same, can the point be fundamental? You may make them no church (as <sup>d</sup>Bellarmino doth) and so deny them salvation, which cannot be had out of the true church; but I for my part dare not so do. And Rome in this particular should be more moderate, if it be but because this article (*Filioque*) was added to the Creed by herself. And it is hard to add and anathematize too.

III.—It ought to be no easy thing to condemn a man of heresy in foundation of faith; much less a church; least of all so ample and large a church as the Greek, especially so as to make them no church. Heaven gates were not so easily shut against multitudes when St. Peter wore the keys at his

<sup>a</sup> Pluralitas in voce, salvata unitate in re, non repugnat unitati fidei. Durand. lib. 3. d. 25. q. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Magist. 1. Sent. d. 11. D. Sane sciendum est, quod licet in præsentî articulo a nobis Græci verbo discordent, tamen sensu non differunt, &c.—Bandinus, lib. 1. de Trin. d. 11. et Bonavent. in 1 Sent. d. 11. A. 1. q. 1. §. 12. Licet Græcis infensissimus, quum dixit Græcos objicere curiositatem Romanis, addendo *Filioque*; quia sine hujus articuli professione salus erat; non respondet negando salutem esse, sed dicit tantum opportunam fuisse determinationem propter periculum. Et postea §. 15: Sunt qui volunt sustinere opinionem Græcorum, et Latinorum, distinguendo duplicem modum procedendi.

Sed forte si duo sapientes, unus Græcus, alter Latinus, uterque verus amator veritatis, et non propriæ dictionis, &c. de hac visa contrarietate disquirent, pateret utique tandem ipsam contrarietatem non esse veraciter realem, sicut est vocalis. Scotus in 1. Sent. d. 11.

q. 1.—Antiquorum Græcorum a Latinis discrepantia in voce potius est, et modo explicandi emanationem Spiritus Sancti quam in ipsa re, &c. Jodocus Clichtoveus in Damasc. lib. 1. Fid. Orth. c. 11.—Et quidam ex Græcis concedunt, quod sit a Filio, vel ab eo profluat. Thom. p. 1. q. 36. A. 2. C.—Et Thomas ipse dicit, Spiritum Sanctum procedere mediate a Filio. Ib. A. 3. ad 1. saltem ratione personarum spirantium.

Respondeo cum Bessarione et Genadio, Damascenum non negasse Spiritum Sanctum procedere ex Filio, quod ad rem attinet, quum dixerit Spiritum esse imaginem Filii, et per Filium, sed existimasse tutius dici per Filium, quam ex Filio, quantum ad modum loquendi, &c. Bellarm. lib. 2. de Christo, c. 27. §. Respondeo igitur. Et Tollet, in S. Joh. 15. Ar. 25. et Lutheran. Resp. ad Resp. 2. Jeremiæ Patriarchæ.

<sup>c</sup> Eadem penitus sententia, ubi supra, Clichtov.

<sup>d</sup> Bellarm. 4. de Notis Eccl. cap. 8. §. Quod autem apud Græcos.



own girdle. And it is good counsel which <sup>e</sup>Alphonsus <sup>a</sup>Sect. 9, 10. Castro, one of your own, gives: "Let them consider that pronounce easily of heresy, how easy it is for themselves to err." Or if you will pronounce, consider what it is that separates from the church simply, and not in part only. I must needs profess, that I wish heartily (as well as <sup>f</sup>others) that those distressed men, whose cross is heavy already, had been more plainly and moderately dealt withal, though they think a diverse thing from us, than they have been by the church of Rome. But hereupon you say you were forced—

¶. Whereupon I was forced to repeat what I had formerly brought against Dr. White, concerning points fundamental.

¶. I.—Hereupon it is true, that you read a large discourse <sup>Sect. 10.</sup> out of a book printed, which, you said, was yours; the particulars (all of them at the least) I do not now remember, nor did I then approve. But if they be such as were formerly brought against Dr. White, they are by him formerly answered. The first thing you did was the <sup>g</sup>righting of St. Augustine; which sentence I do not at all remember was so much as named in the conference, much less was it stood upon, and then righted by you. Another place of St. Augustine indeed was (which you omit, but it comes after) about tradition, to which I remit it. But now you tell us of a great proof made out of this <sup>h</sup>place: for these words of yours contain two propositions: one, "That all points defined by the church are fundamental;" the other, "That this is proved out of this place of St. Augustine."

II.—1. For the first, That all points defined by the church are fundamental. It was not the least means by which Rome grew to her greatness, to blast every opposer she had with

<sup>e</sup> Lib. 3. cont. Hæres. fol. 93. A. Ut videant hi, qui facile de hæresi pronuntiant, quam facile etiam ipsi errent: et intelligant, non esse tam leviter de hæresi censendum, &c. In verbo Beatitudo.

<sup>f</sup> Junius, Animad. in Bellarm. cont. 2. l. 3. c. 23.

<sup>g</sup> *F.* First righting the sentence of St. Austin: Ferendus est disputator errans, &c. Here *A. C.* p. 44. tells us

very learnedly, that my corrupt copy hath *righting* instead of *reading* the sentence of St. Austin. Whereas I here use the word *righting*, not as it is opposed to *reading*, (as any man may discern *A. C.* palpably mistakes,) but for *doing right* to St. Austin. And if I had meant it for *writing*, I should not have spelled it so.

<sup>h</sup> By which is proved, That all points defined by the church are fundamental.

Sect. 10. the name of heretic or schismatic; for this served to shrivel the credit of the persons. And the persons once brought into contempt and ignominy, all the good they desired in the church fell to dust for want of creditable persons to back and support it. To make this proceeding good in these later years, this course (it seems) was taken. The school that must maintain (and so they do) “that all points defined by the church are thereby <sup>i</sup>fundamental, <sup>k</sup>necessary to be believed, <sup>l</sup>of the substance of the faith;” and that, though it be determined quite <sup>m</sup>*extra scripturam*. And then <sup>n</sup>leave the wise and active heads to take order, that there be strength enough ready to determine what is fittest for them.

III.—But since these men distinguish not, nor you, between the church in general, and a general council, which is but her representation for determinations of the faith; though I be very slow in sifting or opposing what is concluded by lawful, general, and consenting authority; though I give as much as can justly be given to the definitions of councils truly general; nay, suppose I should grant (which I do not) that general councils cannot err; yet this cannot down with me, that all points even so defined are fundamental. For deductions are not prime and native principles, nor are superstructures foundations. That which is a foundation for all cannot be one and another to different Christians in regard of itself; for then it could be no common rule for any, nor could the souls of men rest upon a shaking foundation. No: if it be a true foundation, it must be common to all, and firm under all; in which sense the articles of Christian faith are fundamental. And <sup>o</sup>Irenæus lays this for a ground, that the whole church (howsoever dispersed in place) speaks this with one mouth: “He which among the guides of the church is best able to speak utters no more than this; and less than this the most simple doth not utter.” Therefore the Creed (of

<sup>i</sup> Your own word.

<sup>k</sup> *Inconcessa fide ab omnibus* Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. Art. 10. C.

<sup>l</sup> *Scotus* 1. Sent. d. 11. q. 1.

<sup>m</sup> *Ecclesiæ voces etiam extra scripturam.* Stap. Relect. con. 4. q. 1. Ar. 3. *Quæ maturo judicio definiuit, &c. Solidum est, et etiamsi nullo scripturarum aut evidenti, aut probabili testimonio confirmaretur.* ib.

<sup>n</sup> *Et penes Cercopes victoria sit;*

*Greg. Naz. de differen. vite. Cercopes vocat astutos, et veteratorie cujusdam improbitatis episcopos, qui artibus suis ac dolis omnia concilia perturbabant.* Schol. ib.

<sup>o</sup> *Quum enim una et eadem fides sit, neque is qui multum de ipsa dicere potest, plusquam oportet, dicit; neque qui parum, ipsam inminuit.* Iren. lib. 1. advers. Hæres. c. 3.

which he speaks) is a common, is a constant foundation. Sect. 10. And an explicit faith must be of this in them which have the use of reason; for both guides and simple people, all the church, utter this.

IV.—Now many things are defined by the church which are but deductions out of this, which (suppose them deduced right) move far from the foundation; without which deductions explicitly believed, many millions of Christians go to heaven; and cannot therefore be fundamental in the faith. True deductions from the article may require necessary belief in them which are able, and do go along with them from the principle to the conclusion. But I do not see, either that the learned do make them necessary to all, or any reason why they should. Therefore they cannot be fundamental; and yet to some men's salvation they are necessary.

V.—Besides, that which is fundamental in the faith of Christ is a rock immovable, and can never be varied. Never<sup>p</sup>. Therefore, if it be fundamental after the church hath defined it, it was fundamental before the definition, else it is movable; and then no Christian hath where to rest. And if it be immovable, as <sup>q</sup>indeed it is, no decree of a council, be it never so general, can alter immovable verities, no more than it can change immovable natures. Therefore if the church in a council define any thing, the thing defined is not fundamental because the church hath defined it, nor can be made so by the definition of the church, if it be not so in itself. For if the church had this power, she might make a new article of the faith, <sup>r</sup>which the learned amongst yourselves deny: for the articles of the faith cannot increase in substance, but only in explication<sup>s</sup>. And for this I will be judged by Bellarmine, <sup>t</sup>who, disputing against Amb. Catharinus

<sup>p</sup> Resolutio Occhami est, quod nec tota ecclesia, nec concilium generale, nec summus pontifex potest facere articulum, quod non fuit articulus. Sed in dubiis propositionibus potest ecclesia determinare, an sint catholice, &c. Tamen sit determinando non facit quod sint catholice, quum prius essent ante ecclesie determinationem, &c. Almain. in 3. d. 25. q. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Regula fidei una omnino est, sola illa immobilis, et irreformabilis. Tertul. de Virg. vel. cap. 1. In hac fide, &c.

Nihil transmutare, &c. Athan. Epist. ad Jovin. de Fide.

<sup>r</sup> Occham. Almain. in 3. Sent. d. 25. q. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. Ar. 7. C.

<sup>t</sup> Fides divina non ideo habet certitudinem, quia toti ecclesie communis est: sed quia nititur autoritate Dei, qui nec falli nec fallere potest, quum sit ipsa veritas. lib. 3. de Justif. c. 3. §. Quod vero concilium.

Probatio ecclesie facit ut omnibus innotescat objectum (fidei divine) esse

Sect. 10. about the certainty of faith, tells us, "that divine faith hath not its certainty because it is catholic, i. e. common to the whole church, but because it builds on the authority of God, who is truth itself, and can neither deceive nor be deceived." And he adds, "that the probation of the church can make it known to all, that the object of divine faith is revealed from God, and therefore certain, and not to be doubted; but the church can add no certainty, no firmness to the word of God revealing it.

VI.—Nor is this hard to be further proved out of your own school; for "Scotus professeth it in this very particular of the Greek church: "If there be," saith he, "a true real difference between the Greeks and the Latins about the point of the procession of the Holy Ghost, then either they or we be *vere heretici*, truly and indeed heretics." And he speaks this of the old Greeks long before any decision of the church in this controversy: for his instance is in St. Basil and Greg. Nazianz. on the one side, and St. Hierome, Augustine, and Ambrose on the other. "And who dares call any of these heretics?" is his challenge. I deny not but that Scotus adds there, that howsoever this was before, yet *ex quo*, from the time that the catholic church declared it, it is to be held as of the substance of faith. But this cannot stand with his former principle, if he intend by it, that whatsoever the church defines shall be *ipso facto*, and for that determination's sake, fundamental. For if before the determination (supposing the difference real) some of those worthies were truly heretics, (as he confesses,) then somewhat made them so. And that could not be the decree of the church, which then was not: therefore it must be somewhat really false that made them so; and fundamentally false, if it made them heretics against the foundation. But Scotus was wiser than to intend this. It may be he saw the stream too strong for him to swim against, therefore he went on with the doctrine of the time, "that the church's sentence is of the substance of faith;" but meant not to betray the truth: for he goes no further than *ecclesia declaravit*, since the church hath declared it, which is the word that is used by divers<sup>x</sup>.

revelatum a Deo, et propter hoc certum et indubitatum; non autem tribuit firmitatem verbo Dei aliquid revelantis.

ibid. §. At inquit.

<sup>u</sup> Scotus in 1 Sent. d. 11. q. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Bellarm. lib. 2. de Conc. Auth. c.

VII.—Now the <sup>1</sup>master teaches, and the <sup>2</sup>scholars too, Sect. 10. that every thing which belongs to the exposition or declaration of another *intus est*, is not another contrary thing, but is contained within the bowels and nature of that which is interpreted, from which, if the declaration depart, it is faulty and erroneous; because, instead of declaring, it gives another and contrary <sup>a</sup>sense. Therefore, when the church declares any thing in a council, either that which she declares was *intus* or *extra*, in the nature and verity of the thing, or out of it. If it were *extra*, without the nature of the thing declared, then the declaration of the thing is false, and so, far from being fundamental in the faith<sup>b</sup>. If it were *intus*, within the compass and nature of the thing, though not open and apparent to every eye, then the declaration is true, but not otherwise fundamental than the thing is which is declared: for that which is *intus* cannot be larger or deeper than that in which it is; if it were, it could not be *intus*. Therefore nothing is simply fundamental because the church declares it, but because it is so in the nature of the thing which the church declares.

VIII.—And it is a slight and poor evasion that is commonly used, that the declaration of the church makes it fundamental *quoad nos*, in respect of us; for it doth not that neither: for no respect to us can vary the foundation. The church's declaration can bind us to peace and external obedience, where there is not express letter of scripture and sense agreed on; but it cannot make any thing fundamental to us that is not so in it sown nature. For if the church can so add that it can by a declaration make a thing to be

12. Concilia cum definiunt, non faciunt aliquid esse infallibilis veritatis, sed *declariant*. Explicare, Bonavent. in 1. d. 11. A. 1. q. 1. ad finem. Explanare, declarare. Thom. 1. q. 36. A. 2. ad. 2. et 2. q. 1. A. 10. ad. 1.

Quid unquam aliud (ecclesia) conciliorum decretis enisa est, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur. Vin. Lirin. cont. hæ. c. 32.

y Sent. 1. D. 11.

z Alb. Mag. in 1. Sent. D. 11. Art. 7.

a Hoc semper, nec quicquam præterea. Vin. Lirin. c. 32.

b In nova hæresi veritas prius erat

de fide, etsi non ita declarata. Scotus in 1. d. 11. q. 1. in fine. Hæretici multa quæ erant implicita fidei nostræ compulerunt explicare. Bonavent. in 1. d. 11. A. 1. Q. 1. ad finem. Tho. 1. q. 36. A. 2. ad. 2. Quamvis apostolica sedes, aut generale concilium de hæresi censere possit, non tamen ideo assertio aliqua erit hæresis, quia ecclesia definit, sed quia fidei catholicæ repugnat. Ecclesia siquidem sua definitione non facit talem assertionem esse hæresin, quum etiamsi ipsa non definitisset, esset hæresis; sed id efficit ut pateat, &c. Alphon. a Castro, lib. 1. advers. hæres. c. 8. fol. 21. D.



Sect. 10. fundamental in the faith that was not, then it can take a thing away from the foundation, and make it, by declaring, not to be fundamental; which all men grant no power of the church can do. “<sup>d</sup>For the power of adding any thing contrary, and of detracting any thing necessary, are alike forbidden<sup>e</sup>,” and alike denied. Now nothing is more apparent than this to the eye of all men, that the church of Rome hath determined, or declared, or defined (call it what you will) very many things that are not in their own nature fundamental, and therefore neither are nor can be made so by her adjudging them. Now to all this discourse, that the church hath not power to make any thing fundamental in the faith that intrinsically and in its own nature is not such, A. C. is content to say nothing.

IX.—2. For the second, “That it is proved by this place of St. Augustine, That all points defined by the church are fundamental.” You might have given me that place cited in the margin, and eased my pains to seek it; but it may be there was somewhat in concealing it; for you do so extraordinarily right this place, that you were loath (I think) any body should see how you wrong it. The place of St. Augustine is this, against the Pelagians, about remission of original sin in infants: “<sup>f</sup>This is a thing founded: an erring disputer is to be borne with in other questions not diligently digested, not yet made firm by full authority of the church; their error is to be borne with, but it ought not to go so far that it should labour to shake the foundation itself of the church.” This is the place: but it can never follow out of this place (I think) that every thing defined by the church is fundamental.

X.—For, first, he speaks of a foundation of doctrine in scripture, not a church-definition. This appears: for, few lines before, he tells us, “<sup>g</sup>There was a question moved to St. Cyprian, whether baptism was concluded to the eighth day, as well as circumcision? And no doubt was made then

<sup>d</sup> Ecclesia non amputat necessaria, non apponit superflua. Vin. Lirin. c. 32.  
<sup>e</sup> Deut. iv. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Fundata res est. In aliis questionibus non diligenter digestis, nondum plena ecclesie auctoritate firmatis feren-

dus est disputator errans: ibi ferendus est error, non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam fundamentum ipsum ecclesie quaterere moliat. August. Serm. 14. de verb. apost. c. 12.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. c. 20.

of the <sup>h</sup>beginning of sin; and that, <sup>i</sup>out of this thing, about Sect. 10. which no question was moved, that question that was made was answered." And again; "<sup>k</sup>That St. Cyprian took that, which he gave in answer from the foundation of the church, to confirm a stone that was shaking." Now St. Cyprian, in all the answer that he gives, hath not one word of any definition of the church: therefore *ea res*, that thing by which he answered, was a foundation of prime and settled scripture-doctrine, not any definition of the church: therefore, that which he took out of the foundation of the church, to fasten the stone that shook, was not a definition of the church, but the foundation of the church itself, the scripture, upon which it is builded; as appeareth in the <sup>l</sup>Milevitan council, where the rule by which Pelagius was condemned is the rule of <sup>m</sup>scripture. Therefore St. Augustine goes on in the same sense, that the disputer is not to be borne any longer, that "<sup>n</sup>shall endeavour to shake the foundation itself upon which the whole church is grounded."

XI.—Secondly, if St. Augustine did mean by *founded*, and *foundation*, the definition of the church, because of these words, "This thing is founded, this is made firm by full authority of the church;" and the words following these, "to shake the foundation of the church;" yet it can never follow, out of any or all these circumstances, (and these are all,) that all points defined by the church are fundamental in the faith. For, first, no man denies but the church is a <sup>o</sup>*foundation*, that things defined by it are founded upon it; and yet hence it cannot follow that the thing that is so founded is fundamental in the faith: for things may be "<sup>p</sup>founded upon human authority," and be very certain, yet not fundamental in the faith. Nor yet can it follow, "This thing is founded, therefore every thing determined by the church is founded." Again, that which follows, that those things are not to be opposed which are made firm by full authority of the church, cannot conclude they are therefore fundamental in the faith: for full

<sup>h</sup> Origine peccati.

<sup>i</sup> Ex ea re, unde nulla erat quaestio, soluta est exorta quaestio.

<sup>k</sup> Hoc de fundamento ecclesiae sumpsit ad confirmandum lapidem nutantem.

<sup>l</sup> Concil. Milevit. c. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Rom. v. 15.

<sup>n</sup> Ut fundamentum ipsum ecclesiae quaterne moliatur.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 15.

<sup>p</sup> Mos fundatissimus. S. August. ep. 28.



Sect. 10. church-authority (always the time that included the holy apostles being passed by, and not comprehended in it) is but church-authority; and church-authority, when it is at full sea, is not <sup>q</sup>simply divine, therefore the sentence of it not fundamental in the faith. And yet no erring disputer may be endured to “shake the foundation” which the church in council lays. But plain scripture, with evident sense, or a full demonstrative argument, must have room, where a wrangling and erring disputer may not be allowed it. And there is <sup>r</sup>neither of these but may convince the definition of the council, if it be ill founded. And the articles of the faith may easily prove it is not fundamental, if indeed and verily it be not so.

XII.—And I have read somebody that says, (is it not you?) that things are fundamental in the faith two ways: one, in their matter, such as are all things which be so in themselves; the other, in the manner, such as are all things that the church hath defined and determined to be of faith: and that so some things that are *de modo*, of the manner of being, are of faith. But, in plain truth, this is no more than if you should say, some things are fundamental in the faith, and some are not. For, wrangle while you will, you shall never be able to prove that any thing which is but *de modo*, a consideration of the manner of being only, can possibly be fundamental in the faith.

XIII.—And since you make such a foundation of this place, I will a little view the mortar with which it is laid by you. It is a venture but I shall find it <sup>s</sup>*untempered*. Your assertion is, “All points defined by the church are fundamental.” Your proof, this place; “Because that is not to be shaken which is settled by <sup>t</sup>full authority of the church.” Then (it seems) your meaning is, that this point there spoken of, “the remission of original sin in baptism of infants,” was defined, when St. Augustine wrote this, by a full sentence of a general council. First, if you say it was, <sup>u</sup>Bellarmino will tell you it

<sup>q</sup> Stapleton. Relect. cont. 4. q. 3. Art. I.

<sup>r</sup> Quæ quidem, si tam manifesta monstratur, ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in catholica teneor. Ita si aliquid

apertissimum in evangelio. S. August. cont. Fund. c. 4.

<sup>s</sup> Ezek. xiii. 11.

<sup>t</sup> Plena ecclesiæ autoritate.

<sup>u</sup> De Author. Concil. lib. ii. c. 5. §. A solis particularibus.

is false; and that the Pelagian heresy was never condemned Sect. 10. in an œcumenical council, but only in nationals. But Bellarmine is deceived: for while the Pelagians stood out impudently against national councils, some of them defended Nestorius; which gave occasion to the first <sup>x</sup>Ephesine council to excommunicate and depose them. And yet this will not serve your turn for this place; for St. Augustine was then dead, and therefore could not mean the sentence of that council in this place. Secondly, if you say it was not then defined in an œcumenical synod, *plena auctoritas ecclesie*, “the full authority of the church” there mentioned, doth not stand properly for the decree of an œcumenical council, but for some national; as this was condemned in a <sup>y</sup>national council: and then, the full authority of the church here is no more than the full authority of the church of <sup>z</sup>Afric. And I hope that authority doth not make all points defined by it to be fundamental. You will say, Yes, if that council be confirmed by the pope. And then I must ever wonder why St. Augustine should say “the full authority of the church,” and not bestow one word upon the pope, by whose authority only that council, as all other, have their fulness of authority in your judgment: an inexpiable omission, if this doctrine concerning the pope were true.

XIV.—But here A. C. steps in again to help the Jesuit; A. C. p. 45. and he tells us, over and over again, “That all points made firm by full authority of the church are fundamental:” so, firm he will have them, and therefore fundamental. But I must tell him, that, first, it is one thing in nature, and religion too, to be firm, and another thing to be fundamental: these two are not convertible. It is true that every thing that is fundamental is firm; but it doth not follow that every thing that is firm is fundamental. For many a superstructure is exceeding firm, being fast and close joined to a sure foundation; which yet no man will grant is fundamental. Besides, whatsoever is fundamental in the faith is fundamental to the church, which is one by the <sup>a</sup>unity of faith. Therefore, if every thing defined by the church be fundamental in the

<sup>x</sup> Can. 1. et 4.

<sup>y</sup> Concil. Milevit. can. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Nay, if your own Capellus be true, (De Appel. Eccl. Afric. c. 2. n. 5.) it

was but a provincial of Numidia, not a plenary of Afric.

<sup>a</sup> A fide enim una ecclesia dicitur una. Almain. in 3. Sent. Dist. 25. q. 1.

Sect. 10. faith, then the church's definition is the church's foundation. And so upon the matter the church can lay her own foundation; and then the church must be in absolute and perfect being before so much as her foundation is laid. Now this is so absurd for any man of learning to say, that by and by after A. C. is content to affirm, not only that the *prima credibilia*, the articles of faith, "but all which so pertains to supernatural, divine, and infallible Christian faith, as that thereby Christ doth dwell in our hearts, &c. is the foundation of the church under Christ, the prime foundation." And here he is out again: for, first, all which pertains to supernatural, divine, and infallible Christian faith, is not by and by <sup>b</sup>fundamental in the faith to all men. And, secondly, the whole discourse here is concerning faith, as it is taken *objectivè*, for the object of faith and thing to be believed: but that faith by which Christ is said to dwell in our hearts is taken *subjectivè*, for the habit and act of faith. Now, to confound both these in one period of speech can have no other aim than to confound the reader. But to come closer both to the Jesuit and his defender, A. C. If all points made firm by full authority of the church be fundamental, then they must grant that every thing determined by the council of Trent is fundamental in the faith: for with them, it is firm and catholic which that council decrees. Now that council decrees, "<sup>c</sup>That orders collated by the bishop are not void, though they be given without the consent or calling of the people, or of any secular power:" and yet they can produce no author that ever acknowledged this definition of the council fundamental in the faith. It is true, I do not grant that the decrees of this council are made by full authority of the church; but they do both grant and maintain it: and therefore it is *argumentum ad hominem*, a good argument against them, that a thing

<sup>b</sup> Aliquid pertinet ad fidem dupliciter. Uno modo directe, sicut ea quæ nobis sunt principaliter divinitus tradita, ut Deum esse trinum, &c. Et circa hæc opinari falsum hoc ipso inducit hæresin, &c. Alio modo indirecte. Ex quibus consequitur aliquid contrarium fidei, &c. Et in his aliquis potest falsum opinari absque periculo hæresis, donec sequela illa ei innotescat, &c.

Thom. p. 1. q. 32. A. 4. C. "There are things necessary to the faith, and things which are but accessory," &c. Hooker, Eccl. Pol. b. iii. §. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Si quis dixerit ordines ab episcopis collatos sine populi vel potestatis sæcularis consensu aut vocatione irritos esse; anathema sit. Conc. Trid. Sess. 23. can. 7.

so defined may be firm, for so this is, and yet not funda- Sect. 10.  
mental, for so this is not.

XV.—But A. C. tells us further, “That if one may deny A. C. p. 45.  
or doubtfully dispute against any one determination of the  
church, then he may against another, and another, and so  
against all; since all are made firm to us by one and the  
same divine revelation, sufficiently applied by one and the  
same full authority of the church; which being weakened in  
any one cannot be firm in any other.” First, A. C. might  
have acknowledged that he borrowed the former part of this  
out of <sup>d</sup>Vincentius Lirinensis. And as that learned Father  
uses it I subscribe to it, but not as A. C. applies it: for Vin-  
centius speaks there *de catholico dogmate*, of catholic maxims;  
and A. C. will force it to every determination of the church.  
Now catholic maxims, which are properly fundamental, are §. 38. n. 21.  
certain prime truths deposited with the church, and not so  
much determined by the church as published and manifested,  
and so made firm by her to us. For so <sup>e</sup>Vincentius ex-  
pressly. Where all that the church doth is but *ut hoc idem*  
*quod antea*, that the same thing may be believed which was  
before believed, but with more light and clearness, and (in  
that sense) with more firmness than before. Now in this  
sense give way to a *disputator errans*, every cavilling disputer,  
to deny or quarrel at the maxims of Christian religion, any  
one, or any part of any one of them; and why may he not  
then take liberty to do the like of any other, till he have  
shaken all? But this hinders not the church herself, nor any  
appointed by the church, to examine her own decrees, and to  
see that she keep *dogmata deposita*, the principles of faith  
unblemished and uncorrupted. For if she do not so, but that  
<sup>f</sup>*novitia veteribus*, new doctrines be added to the old, the  
church, which is *sacrarium veritatis*, the repository of verity,  
may be changed *in lupanar errorum*, (I am loath to English  
it.) By the church then this may, nay, it ought to be done;

<sup>d</sup> Abdicata enim qualibet parte catho-  
lici dogmatis, alia quoque atque item  
alia, &c. Quid aliud ad extremum se-  
quetur, nisi ut totum pariter repudietur?  
Vin. Lirin. cont. Hæres. c. 31.

<sup>e</sup> Ecclesia depositorum apud se dog-  
matum custos, &c. Denique quid un-  
quam conciliorum decretis enisa est, nisi,

ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur,  
hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur,  
&c. Vin. Lirin. cont. Hæres. c. 32.

<sup>f</sup> Impiorum et turpium errorum lu-  
panar; ubi erat ante castæ et incor-  
ruptæ sacrarium veritatis. Vin. Lirin.  
cont. Hæres. c. 31.

Sect. 10. however, every wrangling disputer may neither deny, nor doubtfully dispute, much less obstinately oppose the determinations of the church, no not where they are not *dogmata deposita*, these deposited principles. But if he will be so bold to deny or dispute the determinations of the church, yet that may be done without shaking the foundation, where the determinations themselves belong but to the fabric, and not to the foundation. For a whole frame of building may be shaken, and yet the foundation where it is well laid remain firm. And therefore after all, A. C. dares not say the foundation is shaken, but only in a sort. And then it is as true, that in a sort it is not shaken.

A. C. p. 46.

XVI.—2. For the second part of his argument, A. C. must pardon me if I dissent from him. For first, “All determinations of the church are not made firm to us by one and the same divine revelation.” For some determinations of the church are made firm to us *per chirographum & scripturæ*, by the handwriting of the scripture; and that is authentical indeed. Some other decisions, yea and of the church too, are made, or may be (if <sup>h</sup> Stapleton inform us right), without an evident, nay without so much as a probable testimony of holy writ. But <sup>i</sup> Bellarmine falls quite off in this, and confesses in express terms, “That nothing can be certain by certainty of faith, unless it be contained immediately in the word of God, or be deduced out of the word of God by evident consequence.” And if nothing can be certain but so, then certainly no determination of the church itself, if that determination be not grounded upon one of these, either express word of God, or evident consequence out of it. So here is little agreement in this great point between Stapleton and Bellarmine. Nor can this be shifted off, as if Stapleton spake of the word of God written, and Bellarmine of the word of God unwritten, (as he calls tradition.) For Bellarmine treats there of the knowledge which a man hath of the certainty of his own salvation. And I hope A. C. will not tell us, there is any tradition extant unwritten by which par-

<sup>g</sup> Vin. Lirin. cont. Hæres. c. 32.

<sup>h</sup> Etiam si nullo scripturarum aut evidenti aut probabili testimonio, &c. Stapleton, Relect. cont. 4. q. 1. Art. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Non potest aliquid certum esse cer-

titudine fidei, nisi aut immediate continetur in verbo Dei, aut ex verbo Dei per evidentem consequentiam deducatur. Bellarm. lib. iii. de Justificat. c. 8. §. Prima ratio.



particular men may have assurance of their several salvations. Sect. 10.  
Therefore Bellarmine's whole disputation there is quite beside the matter: or else he must speak of the written word, and so lie cross to Stapleton, as is mentioned. But to return. If A. C. will, he may, but I cannot believe, that a definition of the church which is made by the express word of God, and another which is made without so much as a probable testimony of it, or a clear deduction from it, are made firm to us by one and the same divine revelation. Nay, I must say in this case, that the one determination is firm by divine revelation, but the other hath no divine revelation at all, but the church's authority only.

2. Secondly, I cannot believe neither, "that all determinations of the church are sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority of the church." For the authority of the church, though it be of the same fulness in regard of itself, and of the power which it commits to general councils lawfully called, yet it is not always of the same fulness of knowledge and sufficiency, nor of the same fulness of conscience and integrity, to apply *dogmata fidei*, that which is dogmatical in the faith. For instance, I think you dare not deny but the council of Trent was lawfully called; and yet I am of opinion, that few, even of yourselves, believe that the council of Trent hath the same fulness with the council of Nice, in all the forenamed kinds or degrees of fulness. Thirdly; suppose "that all determinations of the church are made firm to us by one and the same divine revelation, and sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority;" yet it will not follow that they are all alike fundamental in the faith. For I hope A. C. himself will not say, that the definitions of the church are in better condition than the propositions of canonical scripture. Now all propositions of canonical scripture are alike firm, because they all alike proceed from divine revelation; but they are not all alike fundamental in the faith. For this proposition of Christ to St. Peter and St. Andrew, *Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men*<sup>k</sup>, is as firm a truth as that which he delivered to his disciples, *That he must die, and rise again the third day*<sup>l</sup>; for

<sup>k</sup> Matt. iv. 19.

<sup>l</sup> Matt. xvi. 21.



Sect. 10, 11. both proceed from the same divine revelation, out of the mouth of our Saviour; and both are sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority of the church, which receives the whole Gospel of St. Matthew to be canonical and infallible scripture. And yet both these propositions of Christ are not alike fundamental in the faith. For I dare say no man shall be saved (in the ordinary way of salvation) that believes not the death and the resurrection of Christ. And I believe A. C. dares not say that no man shall be saved into whose capacity it never came that Christ made St. Peter and Andrew fishers of men. And yet should he say it, nay, should he shew it *sub annulo piscatoris*, no man will believe it that hath not made shipwreck of his common notions. Now if it be thus between proposition and proposition issuing out of Christ's own mouth, I hope it may well be so also between even just and true determinations of the church; that supposing them alike true and firm, yet they shall not be alike fundamental to all men's belief.

¶ Secondly, I required to know what points the bishop would account fundamental. He said, all the points of the Creed were such.

Sect. 11. ¶ I.—Against this I hope you except not. For since the <sup>m</sup>Fathers make the Creed the rule of faith; <sup>n</sup>since the agreeing sense of scripture with those articles are the two regular precepts by which a divine is governed about the faith; since your own council of <sup>o</sup>Trent decrees, That it is that principle of faith in which all that profess Christ do necessarily agree, *et fundamentum firmum et unicum*, not the firm alone, but the only foundation; since it is excommunication *ipsis jure* for any man to contradict the articles contained in that Creed; since the whole body of the faith is so contained in the Creed, as that the <sup>q</sup>substance of it was believed even before the coming of Christ, though not so expressly as since in the number of the articles; since <sup>r</sup>Bel-

<sup>m</sup> Tertull. Apol. contra Gentes, c. 47.  
de veland. Virg. c. 1. S. August. Sermon.  
15. de Temp. cap. 2. Rufin. in Symb.  
apud Cyprian. p. 357.

<sup>n</sup> Alb. Mag. in 1. Sent. D. 11. A. 7.

<sup>o</sup> Concil. Trident. Sess. 3.

<sup>p</sup> Bonavent. ibid. Dub. 2. et 3. in  
literam.

<sup>q</sup> Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. Art. 7. c.

<sup>r</sup> Bellarm. lib. iv. de Verb. Dei non  
script. c. 11. §. Primum est.

larmine confesses, that all things simply necessary for all men's salvation are in the Creed and the Decalogue; what reason can you have to except? And yet, for all this, every-thing fundamental is not of a like nearness to the foundation, nor of equal primeness in the faith. And my granting the Creed to be fundamental doth not deny, but that there are *quædam prima credibilia*, certain prime principles of faith, in the bosom whereof all other articles lay wrapped and folded up. One of which, since Christ, is that of <sup>1</sup>St. John; *Every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh is of God*. And one, both before the coming of Christ and since, is that of St. Paul; <sup>2</sup>*He that comes to God must believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him*.

II.—Here A. C. tells you, “That either I must mean, that those points are only fundamental which are expressed in the Creed, or those also which are infolded. If I say those only which are expressed, then,” saith he, “to believe the scriptures is not fundamental, because it is not expressed. If I say those which are infolded in the articles, then some unwritten church traditions may be accounted fundamental.” The truth is, I said, and say still, that all the points of the Apostles' Creed, as they are there expressed, are fundamental. And therein I say no more than some of your best learned have said before me. But I never either said, or meant, that they only are fundamental: that they are <sup>3</sup>*fundamentum unicum*, the only foundation, is the council of Trent's; it is not mine. Mine is, “That the belief of scripture to be the word of God and infallible,” is an equal, or rather a preceding prime principle of faith, with or to the whole body of the Creed. And this agrees (as before I told the Jesuit) with one of your own great masters, Albertus Magnus; who is not far from that proposition *in terminis*. So here the very foundation of A. C.'s dilemma falls off. For I say not, that only the points of the Creed are fundamental, whether expressed or not expressed: that all of them are, that I say. And yet, though the foundation of his dilemma be fallen

<sup>s</sup> Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. A. 7. C.

<sup>t</sup> 1 John iv. 2.                   <sup>u</sup> Heb. xi. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Conc. Trident. Sess. 3.

y III 1 Sent. D. 11. A. 7. Regula

fidei est concursus scripturarum sensus cum articulis fidei: quia illis duobus regularibus præceptis regitur theologus.

Sect. 11, 12. away, I will take the boldness to tell A. C., that if I had said that those articles only which are expressed in the Creed are fundamental, it would have been hard to have excluded the scripture, upon which the Creed itself in every point is grounded; for nothing is supposed to shut out its own foundation. And if I should now say that some articles are fundamental which are infolded in the Creed, it would not follow that therefore some unwritten traditions were fundamental. Some traditions I deny not true and firm, and of great both authority and use in the church, as being apostolical, but yet not fundamental in the faith: and it would be a mighty large fold which should lap up traditions within the Creed. As for that tradition, that the books of holy scriptures are divine, and infallible in every part, I will handle that when I come to the <sup>z</sup>proper place for it.

ff. I asked, how then it happened (as Mr. Rogers saith) that the English church is not yet resolved what is the right sense of the article of Christ's descending into hell.

Sect. 13. ff. I.—The English church never made doubt (that I know) what was the sense of that article. The words are so plain, they bear their meaning before them. She was content to put that <sup>a</sup>article among those to which she requires subscription; not as doubting of the sense, but to prevent the cavils of some who had been too busy in crucifying that article, and in making it all one with the article of the cross, or but an exposition of it.

II.—And surely, for my part, I think the church of England is better resolved of the right sense of this article than the church of Rome; especially if she must be tried by her writers, as you try the church of England by Mr. Rogers: for you cannot agree whether this article be a mere tradition, or whether it hath any place of scripture to warrant it. <sup>b</sup>Scotus and <sup>c</sup>Stapleton allow it no footing in scripture; but <sup>d</sup>Bellarmino is resolute that this article is everywhere in scripture; and <sup>e</sup>Thomas grants as much for the whole Creed.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 16. num. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Art. III.

<sup>b</sup> Scotus in 1. D. 11. q. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Stapleton, Rlect. Con. 5. q. 5. Art. I.

<sup>d</sup> Scripturæ passim hoc docent. Bellarm. de Christ. lib. iv. c. 6 et 12.

<sup>e</sup> Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. A. 9. ad 1.

The church of England never doubted it; and <sup>f</sup>St. Augustine Sect. 12, 13. proves it.

III.—And yet again you are different for the sense: for you agree not whether the soul of Christ, *in triduo mortis*, in the time of his death, did go down into hell really, and was present there, or virtually, and by effects only: for <sup>g</sup>Thomas holds the first, and <sup>h</sup>Durand the latter. Then you agree not whether the soul of Christ did descend really and in essence into the lowest pit of hell and place of the damned, as <sup>i</sup>Bellarmino once held probable, and proved it; or really only into that place or region of hell which you call *limbum patrum*, and then, but virtually, from thence into the lower hell; to which <sup>k</sup>Bellarmino reduces himself, and gives his reason, because it is the <sup>l</sup>common opinion of the school. Now the church of England takes the words as they are in the Creed, and believes them without further dispute, and in that sense which the ancient primitive Fathers of the church agreed in. And yet, if any in the church of England should not be thoroughly resolved in the sense of this article, is it not as lawful for them to say, “I conceive thus or thus of it, yet if any other way of his descent be found truer than this, I deny it not, but as yet I know no other,” as it was for <sup>m</sup>Durand to say it, and yet not impeach the foundation of the faith?

§. The bishop said that Mr. Rogers was but a private man.

But (said I) if Mr. Rogers (writing as he did by public authority) be accounted only a private man,—

§. I.—I said truth when I said Mr. Rogers was a private <sup>Sect. 13.</sup> man. And I take it, you will not allow every speech of every man, though allowed by authority to have his books printed, to be the doctrine of the church of Rome. “This hath been

<sup>f</sup> S. August. ep. 99.

<sup>g</sup> Per suam essentiam. Thom. p. 3. q. 52. A. 2. C.

<sup>h</sup> Durand. in 3. D. 22. q. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Bellarm. de Christ. lib. iv. c. 16.

<sup>k</sup> Bellarm. Recog. p. 11.

<sup>l</sup> Sequuntur enim. Thom. p. 3. q. 52. A. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Non est pertinaciter asserendum, quin anima Christi per alium modum nobis ignotum potuerit descendere ad infernum: nec nos negamus alium modum esse ferisitan viorem; sed fate-mur nos illum ignorare. Durand. in 3.

Sent. Dist. 22. q. 3. num. 9.

<sup>n</sup> And this was an ancient fault too, for St. Augustine checks at it in his time. Noli colligere calumnias ex episcoporum scriptis, sive Hilarii, sive Cypriani et Agrippini. Primum, quia hoc genus literarum ab autoritate canonis distinguendum est. Non enim sic leguntur tanquam ita ex iis testimonium proferatur, ut contra sentire non liceat, sicuti forte aliter sentirent, quam veritas postulat. S. August. ep. 48, &c. And yet these were far greater men in their generations than Mr. Rogers was.

Sect. 13. oft complained of on both sides—the imposing particular men’s assertions upon the church—yet I see you mean not to leave it. And surely, as controversies are now handled (by some of your party) at this day, I may not say it is the sense of the article in hand, but I have long thought it a kind of descent into hell to be conversant in them. I would the authors would take heed in time, and not seek to blind the people, or cast a mist before evident truth, lest it cause a final descent to that place of torment. But since you will hold this course, Stapleton was of greater note with you than Mr. Rogers his Exposition, or Notes upon the Articles of the Church of England, is with us: and as he, so his Relection. And is it the doctrine of the church of Rome which Stapleton affirms, “<sup>o</sup>The scripture is silent that Christ descended into hell, and that there is a catholic and an apostolic church?” If it be, then what will become of the pope’s supremacy over the whole church? Shall he have his power over the catholic church given him expressly in the scripture, in the *keys*, to enter, and in *pasce*, to *feed* when he is in, and when he had fed, to *confirm*; and in all these, not to err and fail in his ministration? and is the catholic church, in and over which he is to do all these great things, quite left out of the scripture? Belike the Holy Ghost was careful to give him his power, yes, in any case, but left the assigning of his great cure, the catholic church, to tradition. And it were well for him if he could so prescribe for what he now claims.

II.—But what if after all this Mr. Rogers there says no such thing? as in truth he doth not. His words are, “<sup>s</sup>All Christians acknowledge he descended; but in the interpretation of the article there is not that consent that were to be wished.” What is this to the church of England more than others? And again, “<sup>t</sup>ill we know the native and undoubted sense of this article.” Is Mr. Rogers’ “we” the church of England, or rather his and some others’ judgment in the church of England?

A. C. p. 47. III.—Now here A. C. will have somewhat again to say, though, God knows, it is to little purpose. It is, “That the

<sup>o</sup> Stapl. Cont. 5. q. 5. A. 1.  
<sup>p</sup> Matt. xvi. 19.  
<sup>q</sup> John xxi. 15. 16.  
<sup>r</sup> Luke xxii. 32.

<sup>s</sup> Rogers in Articulis Eccles. Angl.  
 Art. III.  
<sup>t</sup> Ibid.

Jesuit urged Mr. Rogers' book because it was set out by Sect. 13. public authority, and because the book bears the title of the 'Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England.' A. C. may undoubtedly urge Mr. Rogers, if he please; but he ought not to say that his opinion is the doctrine of the church of England, for neither of the reasons by him expressed. First, not because his book was publicly allowed: for many books among them, as well as among us, have been printed by public authority, as containing nothing in them contrary to faith and good manners, and yet containing many things in them of opinion only or private judgment, which yet is far from the avowed positive doctrine of the church, the church having as yet determined neither way by open declaration upon the words or things controverted. And this is more frequent among their schoolmen than among any of our controversers, as is well known. Nor, secondly, because his book bears the title of the Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England: for suppose the worst, and say Mr. Rogers thought a little too well of his own pains, and gave his book too high a title; is his private judgment therefore to be accounted the catholic doctrine of the church of England? Surely no; no more than I should say, every thing said by <sup>u</sup>Thomas or <sup>x</sup>Bonaventure is angelical or seraphical doctrine, because one of these is styled in the church of Rome seraphical, and the other angelical doctor. And yet their works are printed by public authority, and that title given them.

IV.—“Yea, but our private authors,” saith A. C., “are not A. C. p. 47. allowed (for aught I know) in such a like sort to express our catholic doctrine in any matter subject to question.” Here are two limitations which will go far to bring A. C. off, whatsoever I shall say against him: for, first, let me instance in any private man that takes as much upon him as Mr. Rogers doth, he will say he knew it not, his assertion here being no other than “for aught he knows.” Secondly, if he be unwilling to acknowledge so much, yet he will answer, It is not just in such a like sort as Mr. Rogers doth it, that is, perhaps, it is not the very title of his book. But well then; is there never a private man allowed in the church of Rome to express your

<sup>u</sup> Angelici D. S. Thom. summa.

vent. Doctoris Seraphici in lib. iii. Sent.

<sup>x</sup> Celebratissimi Patris Dom. Bona-

Disputat.



Sect. 13, 14. catholic doctrine in any matter subject to question? What! not in any matter? Were not Vega and Soto two private men? Is it not a matter subject to question, to great question in these days, whether a man may be certain of his being in the state of salvation, *certitudine fidei*, by the certainty of faith? Doth not yBellarmine make it a controversy? and is it not a part of your catholic faith, if it be determined in the zcouncil of Trent? And yet these two great friars of their time, Dominicus Soto and Andreas Vega<sup>a</sup>, were of contrary opinions, and both of them challenged the decree of the council; and so, consequently, your catholic faith to be as each of them concluded: and both of them wrote books to maintain their opinions, and both of their books were published by authority. And therefore I think it is allowed in the church of Rome to private men to express your catholic doctrine, and in a matter subject to question. And therefore also, if another man in the church of England should be of a contrary opinion to Mr. Rogers, and declare it under the title of the catholic doctrine of the church of England, this were no more than Soto and Vega did in the church of Rome.

A. C. p. 47. And I, for my part, cannot but wonder A. C. should not know it; for he says that, for aught he knows, private men are not allowed so to express their catholic doctrine. And in the same question both Catharinus and <sup>b</sup>Bellarmino take on them to express your catholic faith, the one differing from the other almost as much as Soto and Vega, and perhaps in some respect more.

§. But if Mr. Rogers be only a private man, in what book may we find the protestants' public doctrine? The bishop answered that to the Book of Articles they were all sworn,—

Sect. 14. B. I.—What! was I so ignorant to say the articles of the church of England were the public doctrine of all the protestants? or that all the protestants were sworn to the articles of the church of England, as this speech seems to imply? Sure I was not. Was not the immediate speech before of

y Bellarm. de Justific. lib. iii. c. 1 et 14.

z Huic concilio catholici omnes ingenia sua et judicia sponte subjiciunt. Bellarm. de Justific. lib. iii. c. 3. §. Sed

concilii Tridentini.

a Hist. Concil. Trident. lib. ii. p. 245. edit. Lat. Leidæ, 1622.

b Bellarm. de Justific. lib. iii. c. 3.

the church of England? and how comes the subject of the Sect. 14. speech to be varied in the next lines? Nor yet speak I this as if other protestants did not agree with the church of England in the chiefest doctrines, and in the main exceptions which they jointly take against the Roman church; as appears by their several confessions. But if A. C. will say A. C. p. 47. (as he doth), "That because there was speech before of the church of England, the Jesuit understood me in a limited sense, and meant only the protestants of the English church;" be it so; there is no great harm done <sup>c</sup>but this, that the Jesuit offers to inclose me too much. For I did not say that the book of articles only was the continent of the church of England's public doctrine: she is not so narrow, nor hath she purpose to exclude any thing which she acknowledges hers; nor doth she wittingly permit any crossing of her public declarations; yet she is not such a shrew to her children as to deny her blessing, or denounce an anathema against them, if some peaceably dissent in some particulars remoter from the foundation, as your own schoolmen differ. And if the church of Rome, since she grew to her greatness, had not been so fierce in this course, and too particular in determining too many things, and making them matters of necessary belief, which had gone for many hundreds of years before only for things of pious opinion, Christendom (I persuade myself) had been in happier peace at this day than (I doubt) we shall ever live to see it.

II.—Well; but A. C. will prove the church of England a A. C. p. 48. shrew, and such a shrew; for, in her Book <sup>d</sup>of Canons, she excommunicates every man who shall hold any thing contrary to any part of the said articles. So A. C. But surely, these are not the very words of the canon; nor, perhaps, the sense. Not the words; for they are, "Whosoever shall affirm that the articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous," &c. And perhaps not the sense; for it is one thing for a man to hold an opinion privately within himself, and another thing boldly and publicly to affirm it. And again, it is one thing to hold contrary to some part of an article, which, perhaps, may be but in the manner of expression; and another

<sup>c</sup> And therefore A. C. needs not make such a noise about it as he doth, p. 48.

<sup>d</sup> Can. 5.

Sect. 14, 15. thing positively to affirm, that the articles, in any part of them, are superstitious and erroneous. But this is not the main of the business: for though the church of England denounce excommunication, as is before expressed, yet she comes far short of the church of Rome's severity; whose anathemas are not only for thirty-nine articles, but for very many more, fabove one hundred in matters of doctrine; and that, in many points, as far remote from the foundation, though to the far greater rack of men's consciences, they must be all made fundamental, if that church have once determined them: whereas the church of England never declared that every one of her articles are fundamental in the faith. For it is one thing to say no one of them is superstitious or erroneous, and quite another to say every one of them is fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all men's belief. Besides, the church of England prescribes only to her own children, and, by those articles, provides but for her own peaceable consent in those doctrines of truth; but the church of Rome severely imposes her doctrine upon the whole world under pain of damnation.

A. C. p. 45.

¶ And that the scriptures only, not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of their faith.

Sect. 15. 33. I.—The church of England grounded her positive articles upon scripture; and her negative do refute there, where the thing affirmed by you is not affirmed by scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And here, not the church of England only. but all protestants agree most truly and most strongly in this, That the scripture is sufficient to salvation, and contains in it all things necessary to it. The Fathers <sup>g</sup> are plain; the <sup>h</sup> schoolmen not strangers in it: and

<sup>e</sup> Can. 5. <sup>f</sup> Concil. Trident.  
<sup>g</sup> S. Basil. de vera et pia Fide. Manifesta defectio fidei est importare quicquam eorum quæ scripta non sunt. S. Hilar. lib. ii. ad Const. Aug. Fidem tantum secundum ea quæ scripta sunt desiderantem, et hoc qui repudiat, Antichristus est, et qui simulat, anathema est. S. Aug. lib. ii. de Doctr. Christian. c. 9. In iis quæ aperte in scriptura posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi. And to this place Bellarm. lib. iv. de

Verbo Dei non scripto, cap. 11, saith, that St. Augustine speaks de illis dogmatibus quæ necessaria sunt omnibus simpliciter, of those points of faith which are necessary simply for all men. So far then he grants the question. And that you may know it fell not from him on the sudden, he had said as much before in the beginning of the same chapter; and here he confirms it again.

<sup>h</sup> Scotus, Proleg. in Sent. q. 2. Scriptura sufficienter continet doctrinam ne-

have not we reason then to account it, as it is, the foundation of our faith? And <sup>i</sup>Stapleton himself, though an angry opposite, confesses, “That the scripture is, in some sort, the foundation of faith; that is, in the nature of testimony, and in the matter or thing to be believed.” And if the scripture be the foundation to which we are to go for witness, if there be doubt about the faith, and in which we are to find the thing that is to be believed as necessary in the faith; we never did nor never will refuse any tradition that is universal and apostolic, for the better exposition of the scripture; nor any definition of the church, in which she goes to the scripture for what she teaches; and thrusts nothing, as fundamental in the faith, upon the world, but what the scripture fundamentally makes *materiam credendorum*, the substance of that which is so to be believed; whether immediately and expressly in words, or more remotely, where a clear and full deduction draws it out.

II.—Against the beginning of this paragraph A. C. ex-<sup>A. C. p. 48.</sup> cepts. And first, he says, “It is true that the church of England grounded her positive articles upon scripture: that is, it is true, if themselves may be competent judges in their own cause.” But this, by the leave of A. C., is true, without making ourselves judges in our own cause. For “that all the positive articles of the present church of England are grounded upon scripture,” we are content to be judged by the joint and constant belief of the Fathers, which lived within the first four or five hundred years after Christ, when the church was at the best; and by the councils held within those times; and to submit to them in all those points of doctrine. Therefore we desire not to be judges in our own cause. And if any whom A. C. calls a novelist can truly say and maintain this, he will quickly prove himself no novelist. And for the negative articles; they refute, where the thing affirmed by you is either not affirmed in scripture, or not directly to be concluded out of it. Upon this negative

cessariam viatori. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. A. 10. ad 1. In doctrina Christi et apostolorum, veritas fidei est sufficienter explicata. And he speaks there of the written word.

<sup>i</sup> Scripturam fundamentum esse et columnam fidei fatemur in suo genere, i. e. in genere testimoniorum, et in materia credendorum. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 1. Ar. 3. in fine.

Sect. 15.  
A. C. p. 4. ground A. C. infers again, "That the baptism of infants is not expressly (at least, not evidently) affirmed in scripture, nor directly (at least, not demonstratively) concluded out of it." In which case, he professes, "he would gladly know what can be answered, to defend this doctrine to be a point of faith necessary for the salvation of infants." And in conclusion professes, "he cannot easily guess what answer can be made, unless we will acknowledge authority of church tradition necessary in this case."

III.—And truly, since A. C. is so desirous of an answer, I will give it freely. And first, in the general. I am no way satisfied with A. C. his addition, "not expressly; at least, not evidently." What means he? If he speak of the letter of the scripture, then, whatsoever is expressly is evidently in the scripture; and so his addition is vain. If he speak of the meaning of the scripture, then his addition is cunning; for many things are expressly in scripture, which yet, in their meaning, are not evidently there. And, whatever he mean, my words are, "That our negative articles refute that which is not affirmed in scripture," without any addition of expressly, or evidently. And he should have taken my words as I used them. I like nor change nor addition; nor am I bound to either of A. C.'s making. And I am as little satisfied with his next addition "nor directly, at least, not demonstratively, concluded out of it." For are there not many things in good logic concluded directly, which yet are not concluded demonstratively? Surely there are. For to be directly or indirectly concluded, flows from the mood or form of the syllogism; to be demonstratively concluded, flows from the matter or nature of the propositions. If the propositions be prime and necessary truths, the syllogism is demonstrative and scientific, because the propositions are such. If the propositions be probable only, though the syllogism be made in the clearest mood, yet is the conclusion no more. The inference or consequence, indeed, is clear and necessary; but the consequent is but probable or topical, as the propositions were. Now my words were only for a direct conclusion, and no more: though, in this case, I might give A. C. his caution: for scripture here is the thing spoken of. And scripture being a principle, and every text of scripture confessedly a



principle among all Christians, whereof no man <sup>k</sup> desires any further proof; I would fain know why that which is plainly and apparently, that is, by direct consequence, proved out of scripture, is not demonstratively or scientifically proved? If, at least, he think there can be any demonstration in divinity: and if there can be none, why did he add “demonstratively?”

IV.—Next, in particular; I answer to the instance which A. C. makes concerning the baptism of infants, That it may <sup>A. C. p. 49.</sup> be concluded directly (and let A. C. judge, whether not demonstratively) out of scripture, both that infants ought to be baptized, and that baptism is necessary to their salvation. And first, that baptism is necessary to the salvation of infants (in the ordinary way of the church, without binding God to the use and means of that sacrament to which he hath bound us) <sup>l</sup>is express in St. John iii. 5: *Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* So, no baptism, no entrance. Nor can infants creep in any other ordinary way. And this is the received opinion of all the ancient church of <sup>m</sup>Christ. And

<sup>k</sup> *Habitus enim fidei ita se habet in ordine ad theologiam, sicut se habet habitus intellectus ad scientias humanas.* M. Canus, lib. ii. de Loc. c. 8.

<sup>l</sup> St. August. expressly of the baptism of infants. Lib. i. de Peccato, Mer. et Remiss. c. 30. et lib. ii. c. 27; et lib. iii. de Anima et ejus Origine, c. 13. Nay, they of the Roman party which urge the baptism of infants as a matter of faith, and yet not to be concluded out of scripture, when they are not in eager pursuit of this controversy, but look upon truth with a more indifferent eye, confess as much (even the learnedest of them) as we ask. *Advertendum autem Salvatorem dum dicit, Nisi quis renatus, &c. necessitatem imponere omnibus, ac proinde parvulos debere renasci ex aqua et Spiritu.* Jansen. Harm. in Evang. c. 20. So here is baptism necessary for infants, and that necessity imposed by our Saviour, and not by the church only. Heretici nullo alio quam hoc scripture testimonio probare possunt, infantes esse baptizandos. Mald. in S. Joh. iii. 5. So Maldonat confesses, that the heretics (we know whom he means) can prove the baptism of infants by no testimony of scripture but this: which speech implies, that by this testimony of scripture it is and

can be proved; and therefore not by church tradition only. And I would fain know why Bellarmine, lib. i. de Baptism. cap. 8. §. 5, should bring three arguments out of scripture to prove the baptism of infants, “Habemus in scripturis tria argumenta, &c.” if baptism cannot be proved at all out of scripture, but only by the tradition of the church. And yet this is not Bellarmine’s way alone, but Suarez’s, in Thom. p. 3. q. 68. Disput. 25. sect. i. §. 2. *Ex scriptura possunt varia argumenta sumi ad confirmandum pædobaptismum. Et similiter, &c.* And Greg. de Valentia, L. de Baptism. Parvulorum, c. 2. §. 1. And the pope himself, Innocent. III. lib. 3. Decretal. Tit. 42. cap. Majores. And they all jump with St. Ambr. lib. x. Epist. 84. ad Demetriadem Virginem, who expressly affirms it, Pædobaptismum esse constitutionem Salvatoris; and proves it out of John iii. 5.

<sup>m</sup> Infantes reus esse originalis peccati, et ideo baptizandos esse, antiquam fidei regulam vocat. S. Aug. Serm. 8. de Verb. Apost. c. 8. *Et nemo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas, hoc ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, hoc a majorum fide recepit, &c.* S. Aug. Serm. 10. de Verb. Apost. c. 2. et



Sect. 15. secondly, That infants ought to be baptized, is, first, plain by evident and direct consequence out of scripture. For if there be no salvation for infants in the ordinary way of the church but by baptism, and this appear in scripture, as it doth, then, out of all doubt, the consequence is most evident out of that scripture, that infants are to be baptized, that their salvation may be certain. For they which cannot <sup>n</sup> help themselves must not be left only to extraordinary helps, of which we have no assurance, and for which we have no warrant at all in scripture, while we, in the mean time, neglect the ordinary way and means commanded by Christ. Secondly, it is very near an expression in scripture itself. For when <sup>o</sup> St. Peter had ended that great sermon of his, Acts ii., he applies two comforts unto them, verse 38: *Amend your lives, and be baptized, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* And then, verse 39, he infers, *For the promise is made to you and to your children.* The promise; what promise? What! Why the promise of sanctification by the Holy Ghost. By what means? Why, by baptism. For it is expressly, *Be baptized, and ye shall receive.* And as expressly, *This promise is made to you and to your children.* And therefore A. C. may find it, if he will, “That the baptism of infants may be directly concluded out of scripture.” For some of his own party, <sup>p</sup> Ferus and <sup>q</sup> Salmeron, could both find it there. And so (if it will do him any pleasure) he hath my answer, which, he saith, he would be glad to know.

V.—It is true, <sup>r</sup> Bellarmine presses a main place out of St. Augustine, and he urges it hard. St. Augustine’s <sup>s</sup> words are, “The custom of our mother the church in baptizing infants is by no means to be contemned or thought superfluous, nor yet at all to be believed, unless it were an apostolical tradition.” The place is truly cited, but seems a great

S. Ambros. lib. x. Ep. 84. circa medium. Et S. Chrysost. Hom. de Adam et Eva. Hoc prædicat ecclesia catholica ubique diffusa.

<sup>n</sup> Egi causam eorum qui pro se loqui non possunt, &c. S. Aug. Serm. 8. de Verb. Apost. c. 8.

<sup>o</sup> Acts ii. 38, 39.

<sup>p</sup> Nullum excipit, non Judæum, non Gentilem, non adultum, non puerum, &c. Ferus in Act. ii. 39.

<sup>q</sup> *Et ad filios vestros: quare debent*

consentire, quum ad usum rationis perveniunt, ad implenda promissa in baptismo, &c. Salm. Tract. 14, upon the place.

<sup>r</sup> Bellarm. de verbo Dei, lib. iv. c. 9. §. 5.

<sup>s</sup> Consuetudo matris ecclesie in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, nec omnino credenda, nisi apostolica esset traditio. S. August. Gen. ad Lit. c. 23.

deal stronger than indeed it is. For first, it is not denied Sect. 15. that this is an apostolical tradition, and therefore to be believed. But, secondly, not therefore only. Nor doth St. Augustine say so, nor doth Bellarmine press it that way. The truth is, it would have been somewhat difficult to find the collection out of scripture only for the baptism of infants, since they do not actually believe. And therefore St. Augustine is at *nec credenda nisi*, that this custom of the church had not been to be believed, had it not been an apostolical tradition. But the tradition being apostolical led on the church easily to see the necessary deduction out of scripture. And this is not the least use of tradition, to lead the church into the true meaning of those things which are found in scripture, though not obvious to every eye there. And that this is St. Augustine's meaning is manifest by himself, who best knew it. For when he had said, 'as he doth, that to baptize children is *antiqua fidei regula*, the ancient rule of faith, and the constant tenet of the church, yet he doubts not to collect and deduce it out of scripture also. For when Pelagius urged that infants needed not to be baptized because they had no original sin, St. Augustine relies not upon the tenet of the church only, but argues from the text thus: "What need have infants of Christ, if they be not sick?" for the sound need not the physician, St. Matth. ix. And again, is not this said by Pelagius, *ut non accedant ad Jesum*, that infants may not come to their Saviour? *Sed clamat Jesus*, but Jesus cries out, *Suffer little ones to come unto me*<sup>x</sup>, St. Mark x. And all this is fully acknowledged by <sup>y</sup> Calvin, namely, "That all men acknowledge the baptism of infants to descend from apostolical tradition:"<sup>z</sup> and yet that "it doth not depend upon the bare and naked authority of the church." Which he speaks not in regard of tradition, but

<sup>t</sup> Cur antiquam fidei regulam frangere conaris? S. August. Serm. 8. de Verb. Apost. c. 8. Hoc ecclesia semper tenuit. Ibid. Serm. 10. c. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Quid necessarium habuit infans Christum, si non agrotat? S. Matt. ix. 12. Quid est quod dicis, nisi ut non accedant ad Jesum? Sed tibi clamat Jesus, *Sine parvulos venire ad me*. S. August. in the forecited places.

<sup>x</sup> Mark x. 14.

<sup>y</sup> Nullus est scriptor tam vetustus, qui non ejus originem ad apostolorum seculum pro certo referat. Calv. 4. Inst. c. 16. §. 8.

<sup>z</sup> Miserrimum asylum foret, si pro defensione paedobaptismi ad nudam ecclesie auctoritatem fugere cogermur. Calv. 4. Inst. c. 8. §. 16.

Sect. 15, 16. in relation to such proof as is to be made by necessary consequence out of scripture over and above tradition.

VI.—As for tradition, <sup>a</sup> I have said enough for that, and as much as A. C. where it is truly apostolical. And yet if any thing will please him, I will add this concerning this particular, the baptizing of infants; that the church received this by <sup>b</sup> tradition from the apostles. By tradition. And what then? May it not directly be concluded out of scripture, because it was delivered to the church by way of tradition? I hope A. C. will never say so. For certainly in doctrinal things, nothing so likely to be a tradition apostolical as that which hath a <sup>c</sup> root and a foundation in scripture. For apostles cannot write or deliver contrary, but subordinate and subservient things.

¶ I asked how he knew scripture to be scripture, and in particular, Genesis, Exodus, &c. These are believed to be scripture, yet not proved out of any place of scripture. The bishop said, That the books of scripture are principles to be supposed, and needed not to be proved.

Sect. 16.

33. I.—I did never love too curious a search into that which might put a man into a wheel, and circle him so long between proving scripture by tradition and tradition by scripture, till the devil find a means to dispute him into infidelity, and make him believe neither. I hope this is no part of your meaning. Yet I doubt this <sup>d</sup> question, “How do you know scripture to be scripture?” hath done more harm than you will be ever able to help by tradition. But I must follow that way which you draw me. And because

<sup>a</sup> §. 15. Num. 1. A. C. p. 49.

<sup>b</sup> Orig. in Rom. vi. 6. tom. ii. p. 543. Pro hoc ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Et S. August. Serm. 10. de Verb. Apost. c. 2. Hoc ecclesia a majorum fide percepit. And it is to be observed, that neither of these Fathers (nor I believe any other) say that the church received it *a traditione sola*, or *a majorum fide sola*; as if tradition did exclude collection of it out of scripture.

<sup>c</sup> Yea, and Bellarmine himself avers, Omnes traditiones, &c. contineri in scripturis in universali. De Verb. Dei non scripto, lib. iv. c. 10. §. Sic etiam. And St. Basil, Serm. de Fide approves only those agrapha, quæ non sunt aliena a pia secundum scripturam sententia.

<sup>d</sup> Qui conantur fidem destruere sub specie questionis difficilis, aut forte indissolubilis, &c. Orig. Quest. 35. in S. Matth.

it is so much insisted upon by you, and is in itself a <sup>c</sup> matter Sect. 16. of such consequence, I will sift it a little further.

II.—Many men labouring to settle this great principle in divinity, have used divers means to prove it. All have not gone the same way, nor all the right way. You cannot be right, that resolve faith of the scriptures, being the word of God, into only tradition. For only, and no other proof, are equal. To prove the scripture therefore (so called by way of excellence) to be the word of God, there are several offers at divers proofs. For first, some fly to the testimony and witness of the church and her tradition, which constantly believes and unanimously delivers it. Secondly, some to the light and the testimony which the scripture gives to itself; with other internal proofs which are observed in it, and to be found in no other writing whatsoever. Thirdly, some to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, which clears up the light that is in scripture, and seals this faith to the souls of men, that it is God's word. Fourthly, all that have not imbrutished themselves, and sunk below their species and order of nature, give even natural reason leave to come in and make some proof, and give some approbation upon the weighing and the consideration of other arguments. And this must be admitted, if it be but for pagans and infidels, who either consider not or value not any one of the other three: yet must some way or other be converted, or *left without excuse*<sup>f</sup>, Rom. i. 20, and that is done by this very evidence.

III.—For the first, the tradition of the church, which is your way: that taken and considered alone is so far from being the only, that it cannot be a sufficient proof to believe by divine faith that scripture is the word of God. For that which is a full and sufficient proof is able of itself to settle the soul of man concerning it. Now the tradition of the church is not able to do this. For it may be further asked, why we should believe the church's tradition? And if it be answered, We may believe, because the church is in-

<sup>c</sup> To know that scriptures are divine and infallible in every part, is a foundation so necessary, as if it be doubtfully questioned, all the faith built upon scripture falls to the ground. A. C. p. 47. Necesse est nosse extare libros aliquos

vere divinos. Bellarm. lib. iv. de Verb. Dei non scripto, c. 4. §. Quarto necesse. —Et etiam libros qui sunt in manibus esse illos. Ibid. §. Sexto oportet.

<sup>f</sup> Rom. i. 20.

Sect. 16. fallibly governed by the Holy Ghost; it may yet be demanded of you, how that may appear? And if this be demanded, either you must say you have it by special revelation, which is the private spirit you object to other men; or else you must attempt to prove it by scriptures, as all of you do. And that very offer, to prove it out of scripture, is a sufficient acknowledgment that the scripture is a higher proof than the church's tradition, which (in your grounds) is, or may be, questionable till you come thither. Besides, this is an inviolable ground of reason, " <sup>b</sup>That the principles of any conclusion must be of more credit than the conclusion itself." Therefore, if the articles of faith, the Trinity, the resurrection, and the rest, be the conclusions, and the principles by which they are proved be only ecclesiastical tradition, it must needs follow, that the tradition of the church is more infallible than the articles of the faith; if the faith which we have of the articles should be finally resolved into the veracity of the church's testimony. But this your learned and wary men deny; and therefore I hope yourself dare not affirm.

IV.—Again; if the voice of the church (saying "the books of scripture commonly received are the word of God") be the formal object of faith, upon which alone absolutely I may resolve myself; then every man not only may, but ought to resolve his faith into the voice or tradition of the church: for every man is bound to rest upon the proper and formal object of the faith. But nothing can be more evident than this, "That a man ought not to resolve his faith of this principle into the sole testimony of the church." Therefore neither is that testimony, or tradition alone, the formal object of faith. <sup>k</sup>The learned of your own part grant this:

<sup>g</sup> Esse aliquas veras traditiones demonstratur ex scripturis. Bellarmin. lib. iv. de Verbo Dei non scripto, c. 5. and A. C. p. 50. proves tradition out of 2 Thes. ii. 15.

<sup>h</sup> Arist. 1. Post. c. 2. T. xvi. per Pacium. Quocirca si διὰ τὰ πρῶτα, propter prima scimus et credimus, illa quoque scimus et credimus μᾶλλον, magis, quia per illa scimus et credimus etiam posteriora.

<sup>i</sup> Eorum errorem dissimulare non

possum, qui asserunt fidem nostram eo tanquam in ultimam credendi causam reducendam esse. Ut credamus ecclesiam esse veracem, &c. M. Canus, lib. ii. de Locis, c. 8. §. Cui, et tertium.

<sup>k</sup> Vox ecclesie non est formale obiectum fidei. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 3. A. 2.—Licet in articulo fidei *Credo ecclesiam* forte continuatur hoc totum, *Credo ea quæ docet ecclesia*: tamen non intelligitur necessario, quod *Credo* docenti ecclesie tanquam testi



“Although in that article of the Creed, ‘I believe the catholic church,’ peradventure all this be contained, I believe those things which the church teacheth; yet this is not necessarily understood, that I believe the church teaching as an infallible witness.” And if they did not confess this, it were no hard thing to prove.

V.—But here is the cunning of this device. All the authorities of Fathers, councils, nay, of scripture too,<sup>1</sup> (though this be contrary to their own doctrine,) must be finally resolved into the authority of the present Roman church. And though they would seem to have us believe the Fathers and the church of old, yet they will not have us take their doctrine from their own writings, or the decrees of councils; because (as they say) we cannot know by reading them what their meaning was, but from the infallible testimony of the present Roman church teaching by tradition. Now by this two things are evident. First, that they ascribe as great authority (if not greater) to a part of the catholic church as they do to the whole, which we believe in our Creed, and which is the society of all Christians. And this is full of absurdity in nature, in reason, in all things, that any <sup>m</sup>part should be of equal worth, power, credit, or authority with the whole. Secondly, that in their doctrine concerning the infallibility of their church, their proceeding is most unreasonable. For if you ask them why they believe their whole doctrine to be the sole true catholic faith? their answer is, “Because it is agreeable to the word of God, and the doctrine and tradition of the ancient church.” If you ask them how they know that to be so?

infallibili. Ibid.—Ubi etiam rejicit opinionem Durandi et Gabr. et Waldens. lib. ii. Doctr. Fidei Art. 2. c. 21. num. 4. Testimonium ecclesie catholice est objectum fidei Christiane, et legislatio scripturae canonice, subjicitur tamen ipsi, sicut testis judici, et testimonium veritati. &c.—Cannus, Loc. lib. ii. cap. 8. Nec si ecclesia aditum nobis praebet ad hujusmodi libros sacros cognoscendos, protinus ibi acquiescendum est, sed ultra oportet progredi, et solida Dei veritate niti, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Omnis ergo ecclesiastica auctoritas, cum sit ad testificandum de Christo

et legibus ejus, vilior est Christi legibus et scripturis sanctis necessario postponenda. Wald. lib. ii. Doctr. Fidei Art. 2. cap. 21. num. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Totum est majus sua parte. Etiam si axioma sit apud Euclidem, non tamen ideo geometricum putandum est, quia geometres eo utitur. Utitur enim et tota logica. Ram. in Schol. Matth. And Aristotle vindicates such propositions τὰ ἐν τοῖς μαθήμασι καλούμενα ἀξιώματα from being usurped by particular sciences: ἅπασιν γὰρ ὑπάρχει, &c., quia conveniunt omni enti, et non alicui generi separatim. Metaph. lib. iv. c. 3. tom. vii.



Sect. 16. they will then produce testimonies of scripture, councils, and Fathers. But if you ask a third time, by what means they are assured that these testimonies do indeed make for them and their cause? they will not then have recourse to text of scripture, or exposition of Fathers, or phrase and propriety of language, in which either of them were first written, or to the scope of the author, or the <sup>n</sup> causes of the thing uttered, or the conference with like <sup>o</sup> places, or the antecedents <sup>p</sup> and consequents of the same places, <sup>q</sup> or the exposition of the dark and doubtful places of scripture by the undoubted and manifest; with divers other rules given for the true knowledge and understanding of scripture, which do frequently occur in <sup>r</sup> St. Augustine. No, none of these or the like helps: that, with them, were to admit a private spirit, or to make way for it. But their final answer is, “They know it to be so, because the present Roman church witnesseth it according to tradition.” So arguing *a primo ad ultimum*, from first to last; the present church of Rome and her followers believe her own doctrine and tradition to be true and catholic because she professes it to be such. And if this be not to prove *idem per idem*, the same by the same, I know not what is: which, though it be most absurd in all kind of learning, yet out of this I see not how it is possible to wind themselves, so long as the last resolution of their faith must rest (as they teach) upon the tradition of the present church only.

VI.—It seems therefore to me very necessary, <sup>s</sup> that we be

<sup>n</sup> Intelligentia dictorum ex causis est assumenda dicendi, quia non sermoni res, sed rei sermo est subjectus. S. Hilar. lib. iv. de Trin.—Ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. Tert. l. de Resur. Carnis, c. 37.

<sup>o</sup> Videndo differentias similium ad similia. Orig. Tract. 19. in S. Matt.

<sup>p</sup> Recolendum est unde venerit ista sententia, et quæ illam superiora pepererint, quibusque connexa dependeat. S. August. Ep. 29.—Solet circumstantia scripturæ illuminare sententiam. S. Aug. lib. lxxxiii. Quæst. q. 69.

<sup>q</sup> Quæ ambigue et obscure in nonnullis scripturæ sacræ locis dicta videntur, per ea quæ alibi certa et indubitata habentur declarantur. S. Basil. in Regulis contractis, Reg. 267.—Mani-

festiora quæque prævaleant, et de incertis certiora præscribant. Tert. l. de Resur. c. 19. et 21. S. August. lib. iii. de Doctr. Christ. c. 26.—Moris est scripturarum obscuris manifesta subnectere, et quod prius sub ænigmatibus dixerint, aperta voce proferre. S. Hieron. in Esa. 19. princ. vid. §. 26. num. 4.

<sup>r</sup> S. August. lib. iii. de Doctr. Christiana.

<sup>s</sup> And this is so necessary, that Bellarmine confesses, that if tradition (which he relies upon) be not divine, he and his can have no faith. Non habemus fidem. Fides enim verbo Dei nititur. lib. iv. de Verbo Dei, c. 4. §. At si ita est.

And A. C. tells us, p. 47; To know that scripture is divine and infallible

able to prove the books of scripture to be the word of God by some authority that is absolutely divine. For if they be warranted unto us by any authority less than divine, then all things contained in them (which have no greater assurance than the scripture in which they are read) are not objects of divine belief. And that once granted will enforce us to yield, that all the articles of Christian belief have no greater assurance than human or moral faith or credulity can afford. An authority then simply divine must make good the scripture's infallibility, at least in the last resolution of our faith in that point. This authority cannot be any testimony or voice of the church alone. For the church consists of men subject to error; and no one of them, since the apostles' times, hath been assisted with so plentiful a measure of the blessed Spirit as to secure him from being deceived; and all the parts being all liable to mistaking, and fallible, the whole cannot possibly be infallible in and of itself, and privileged from being deceived in some things or other. And even in those fundamental things in which the whole universal church neither doth nor can err, yet even there her authority is not divine, because she delivers those supernatural truths by promise of assistance, yet tied to means; and not by any special immediate revelation, which is necessarily required to the very least degree of divine authority. And therefore our worthies do not only say, but prove, "That all the church's constitutions are of the nature of human law." \*And some among you, not unworthy for their learning, prove it at large, That all the church's testimony, or voice, or sentence (call it what you will) is but *suo modo*, or *aliquo modo*, not simply, but in a manner divine. Yea, and A. C. himself after all A. C. p. 51.

in every part, is a foundation so necessary, as, if it be doubtfully questioned, all the faith built upon scripture falls to the ground. And he gives the same reason for it p. 50. which Bellarmine doth.

<sup>t</sup> Ecclesiam Spiritu afflatam esse, certe credo. Non ut veritatem autoritative libris canonicis tribuat, sed ut doceat illos non alios esse canonicos. Nec si aditum nobis præbet ad hujusmodi sacros libros cognoscendos, pro-

tinus ibi acquiescendum est, sed ultra oportet progredi, et solida Dei veritate niti. Qua ex re intelligitur quid sibi voluerit Augustinus, quum ait, Evangelio non crederem, nisi, &c. M. Canus, lib. ii. de Locis, c. 8. fol. 34. b.—Non docet fundatam esse evangelii fidem in ecclesie autoritate, sed, &c. Ibid.

<sup>u</sup> Hooker, Eccles. Pol. lib. iii. §. 9.

<sup>x</sup> Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 3. A. 1 et 2.

Sect. 16. his debate comes to that, and no further, "That the tradition of the church is, at least in some sort, divine and infallible." Now that which is divine but in a sort or manner, be it the church's manner, is *aliquo modo non divina*, in a sort not divine. But this great principle of faith (the ground and proof of whatsoever else is of faith) cannot stand firm upon a proof that is and is not, in a manner and not in a manner, divine; as it must, if we have no other anchor than the external tradition of the church to lodge it upon, and hold it steady in the midst of those waves which daily beat upon it.

A. C. p. 49. VII.—Now here A. C. confesses expressly, that to prove the books of scripture to be divine, we must be warranted by  
 A. C. p. 50. that which is infallible. He confesses further, "that there can be no sufficient infallible proof of this but God's word, written or unwritten." And he gives his reason for it:  
 A. C. p. 51. "Because, if the proof be merely human and fallible, the science or faith which is built upon it can be no better." So then this is agreed on by me, (yet leaving other men to travel by their own way, so be they can come to make scripture thereby infallible,) that scripture must be known to be scripture by a sufficient, infallible, divine proof. And that such proof can be nothing but the word of God, is agreed on also by me. Yea, and agreed on, for me, it shall be likewise, that God's word may be written and unwritten. For cardinal <sup>y</sup>Bellarmino tells us truly, that it is not the writing or printing that makes scripture the word of God; but it is the prime, unerring, essential truth, God himself, uttering and revealing it to his church, that makes it *verbum Dei*, the word of God. And this word of God is uttered to men, either immediately by God himself, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and so it was to the prophets and apostles; or mediately, either by angels, to whom God had spoken first; and so the law was given, <sup>z</sup>Gal. iii., and so also the message was delivered to the blessed Virgin, <sup>a</sup>Luke i.; or by the pro-

<sup>y</sup> Verbum Dei non est tale, nec habet ullam auctoritatem, quia scriptum est in membranis, sed quia a Deo profectum est. Bellarm. lib. iv. de Verb.

Dei, c. 2. §. Ecclesiasticæ traditiones.

<sup>z</sup> Lex ordinata per angelos in manu mediatoris, Gal. iii. 19.

<sup>a</sup> Luke i. 30.

phets <sup>b</sup>and apostles; and so the scriptures were delivered Sect. 16. to the church. But their being written gave them no authority at all in regard of themselves. Written or unwritten, the word was the same. But it was written that it might be the better <sup>c</sup>preserved, and continued with the more integrity to the use of the church, and the more faithfully in our <sup>d</sup>memories. And you have been often enough told, (were truth, and not the maintaining of a party, the thing you seek for,) that if you will shew us any such unwritten word of God delivered by his prophets and apostles, we will acknowledge it to be divine and infallible. So, written or unwritten, that shall not stumble us. But then A.C. must not tell us, at least not think we shall swallow it into our belief, that every thing which he says is the unwritten word of God is so indeed.

VIII.—I know Bellarmine hath written a whole book *De verbo Dei non scripto*, of the word of God not written, in which he handles the controversy concerning traditions. And the cunning is, to make his weaker readers believe, that all that which he and his are pleased to call traditions, are by and by no less to be received and honoured than the unwritten word of God ought to be. Whereas it is a thing of easy knowledge, that the *unwritten word* of God and *tradition* are not convertible terms, that is, are not all one. For there are many unwritten words of God which were never delivered over to the church, for aught appears; and there are many traditions (affirmed, at least, to be such by the church of Rome) which were never warranted by any unwritten word of God.

<sup>b</sup> The Holy Ghost, &c. which spake by the prophets, in Symb. Nicen.

<sup>c</sup> Nam pseudoprophetae, etiam viventibus adhuc apostolis, multas fingeant corruptelas sub hoc pretextu et titulo, quasi ab apostolis viva voce essent traditae: et propter hanc ipsam causam apostoli doctrinam suam ceperunt literis comprehendere, et ecclesiis commendare. Chem. Exam. Concil. Trid. de Traditionibus sub octavo genere traditis.—And so also Jans. Comment. in Joh. v. 47. Sicut enim firmitus est quod mandatur literis, ita est culpabilius et majus non credere

scriptis, quam non credere verbis.

<sup>d</sup> Labilis est memoria, et ideo indigemus scriptura: dicendum quod verum est, sed hoc non habet, nisi ex inundantia peccatorum. Henr. a Gand. Sum. p. 1. Art. 8. q. 4. fine.—Christus ipse de pectore morituro testamentum transfert in tabulas diu duraturas. Optatus, lib. v. Christus ipse non transtulit, sed ex Optati sententia, ejus inspiratione, si non jussu, apostoli transulerunt.

<sup>e</sup> Bellarm. lib. iv. de Verbo Dei non scripto.

Sect. 16.

IX.—First, That there are many unwritten words of God which were never delivered over to the church, is manifest. For when or where were the words which Christ spake to his apostles during the <sup>f</sup>forty days of his conversing with them after his resurrection first delivered over to the church? Or what were the unwritten words he then spake? If neither he nor his apostles or evangelists have delivered them to the church, the church ought not to deliver them to her children. Or if she do *stradere non traditum*, make a tradition of that which was not delivered to her, and by some of them, then she is unfaithful to God, and doth not *servare depositum*, faithfully keep that which is committed to her trust; <sup>h</sup>1 Tim. vi. And her sons which come to know it are not bound to obey her tradition against the <sup>i</sup>word of their Father. For wheresoever Christ holds his peace, or that his words are not registered, I am of <sup>k</sup>St. Augustine's opinion, no man may dare, without rashness, say they were these or these. So there were many unwritten words of God which were never delivered over to the church, and therefore never made tradition. And there are many traditions which cannot be said to be the unwritten word of God. For I believe a learned Romanist that will weigh before he speaks will not easily say, that to anoint, or use spittle in baptism, or to use three dippings in the use of that sacrament, or divers other like traditions, had their rise from any word of God unwritten. Or if he be so hardy as to say so, it is *gratis dictum*, and he will have enough to do to prove it. So there may be an unwritten word of God which is no tradition. And there are many traditions which are no unwritten word of God. Therefore tradition must be taken two ways: either as it is the church's act delivering, or the thing thereby delivered; and then it is human

<sup>f</sup> Act. i. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Annunciare aliquid Christianis catholicis, præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nusquam licet, nunquam licebit. Vincent. Lirin. c. 14.—Et præcipit nihil aliud innovari, nisi quod traditum est. S. Cyprian. ad Pompeium cont. epist. Stephan., princ.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 20. and 2 Tim. i. 14.

<sup>i</sup> Si ipsa (ecclesia) contraria scripture diceret, (fidelis) ipsi non crederet, &c.

Henr. a Gand. Sum. p. 1. A. 10. q. 1. And Bellarmine himself, that he might the more safely defend himself in the cause of traditions, says, (but how truly, let other men judge,) Nullam traditionem admittimus contra scripturam, lib. iv. de Verbo Dei, cap. 3. §. Deinde commune.

<sup>k</sup> S. August. tom. xvi. in S. Joh. in illa verba, *Multa habeo dicere, sed non potestis portare modo.*



authority, or from it, and unable infallibly to warrant divine Sect. 16.  
 faith, or to be the object of it: or else as it is the unwritten  
 word of God; and then, wherever it can be made to appear  
 so, it is of divine and infallible authority, no question. But  
 then I would have A. C. consider where he is in this parti-  
 cular: he tells us, "We must know infallibly that the books A. C. p. 49.  
 of holy scripture are divine," and that "this must be done by  
 unwritten tradition, but so as that this tradition is the word  
 of God unwritten." Now let him but prove that this or any  
 tradition which the church of Rome stands upon is the word  
 of God, though unwritten, and the business is ended. But A. C. p. 50.  
 A. C. must not think that because the tradition of the church  
 tells me these books are *verbum Dei*, God's word, and that I  
 do both honour and believe this tradition, that therefore this  
 tradition itself is God's word too, and so absolutely sufficient  
 and infallible to work this belief in me. Therefore, for aught  
 A. C. hath yet added, we must on with our inquiry after this  
 great business and most necessary truth.

X.—2. For the second way of proving that scripture should  
 be fully and sufficiently known, as by divine and infallible  
 testimony, *lumine proprio*, by the resplendency of that light  
 which it hath in itself only, and by the witness that it can so  
 give to itself, I could never yet see cause to allow. <sup>1</sup>For as  
 there is no place in scripture that tells us such books con-  
 taining such and such particulars are the canon, and infallible  
 will and word of God; so if there were any such place, that  
 were no sufficient proof: for a man may justly ask another  
 book to bear witness of that, and again of that another; and  
 wherever it were written in scripture, that must be a part of  
 the whole. And no created thing can alone give witness to  
 itself and make it evident, nor one part testify for another,  
 and satisfy where reason will but offer to contest; except  
 those principles only of natural knowledge which appear ma-  
 nifest by intuitive light of understanding, without any dis-  
 course; and yet they also to the weaker sort require induction  
 preceding. Now this inbred light of scripture is a thing  
 coincident with scripture itself; and so the principles and the  
 conclusion in this kind of proof should be entirely the same,

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. ii. §. 4.



Sect. 16. which cannot be. Besides, if this inward light were so clear, how could there have been any variety among the ancient believers touching the authority of <sup>m</sup>St. James' and St. Jude's Epistles and the <sup>n</sup>Apocalypse, with other books which were not received for divers years after the rest of the New Testament? for certainly the light which is in the scripture was the same then which now it is. And how could the Gospel of St. Bartholomew, of St. Thomas, and other counterfeit pieces, obtain so much credit with some as to be received into the canon, if the evidence of this light were either universal or infallible of and by itself? And this though I cannot approve, yet methinks you may, and upon probable grounds at least: for I hope no <sup>o</sup>Romanist will deny but that there is as much light in scripture to manifest and make ostention of itself to be infallibly the written word of God, as there is in any tradition of the church that it is divine, and infallibly the unwritten word of God. And the scriptures saying from the mouths of the prophets, <sup>p</sup>*Thus saith the Lord*, and from the mouths of the apostles, that <sup>s</sup>*the Holy Ghost spake by them*, are at least as able and as fit to bear witness to their own verity as the church is to bear witness to her own traditions by bare saying they come from the apostles: and yourselves would never go to the scripture to prove that there are <sup>r</sup>traditions, as you do, if you did not think the scripture as easy to be discovered by inbred light in itself as traditions by their light. And if this be so, then it is as probable at the least (which some of ours affirm) that scripture may be known to be the word of God by the light and lustre which it hath in itself, as it is (which you <sup>s</sup>affirm) that a tradition may be known to be such by the light which it hath in itself; which is an excellent proposition to make sport withal, were this an argument to be handled merrily.

XI.—3. For the third opinion and way of proving; either some think that there is no sufficient warrant for this, unless

<sup>m</sup> Euseb. lib. ii. c. 27. fine, edit. Basil. 1549.

<sup>n</sup> Euseb. lib. iii. c. 25.

<sup>o</sup> Except A. C., whose boldness herein I cannot but pity: for he denies this light to the scripture, and gives it to tradition. His words are, "Tradition of the church is of a company, which

by its own light shews itself to be infallibly assisted," &c. p. 52.

<sup>p</sup> Isa. xlv. et passim.

<sup>q</sup> Acts xxviii. 25.

<sup>r</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 15. Jude, ver. 3.

<sup>s</sup> In your articles delivered to D. W. to be answered; and A. C. p. 52.

they fetch it from the testimony of the Holy Ghost, and so look in vain after special revelations, and make themselves by this very conceit obnoxious and easy to be led by all the whisperings of a seducing private spirit, or else you would fain have them think so: for your side, both upon this and other occasions, do often challenge that we resolve all our faith into the dictates of a †private spirit; from which we shall ever prove ourselves as free if not freer than you. To the question in hand then: suppose it agreed upon that there must be a †divine faith, *cui subesse non potest falsum*, under which can rest no possible error, that the books of scripture are the written word of God; if they which go to the testimony of the Holy Ghost for proof of this do mean by faith *objectum fidei*, the object of faith that is to be believed, then, no question, they are out of the ordinary way; for God never sent us by any word or warrant of his to look for any such special and private testimony to prove which that book is that we must believe: but if by faith they mean the habit or act of divine infused faith, by which virtue they do believe the credible object and thing to be believed, then their speech is true and confessed by all divines of all sorts: for faith is the †gift of God, of God alone, and an †infused habit, in respect whereof the soul is merely recipient; and therefore the sole infuser, the Holy Ghost, must not be excluded from that work which none can do but he: for the Holy Ghost, as †he first dictated the scripture to the apostles, “as so did he

† A Jesuit, under the name of T. S., set out a book, anno 1630, which he called, *The Trial of the Protestant private Spirit*.

‡ Ut testimonia scripturæ certam et indubitatam fidem præsent, necessariam videtur ostendere, quod ipsæ diviniæ scripturæ sint Dei Spiritu inspiratæ. Orig. 4. *περὶ ἀρχῶν*.

× 1 Cor. xii. 3, 4. Datur nobis a Deo, &c. S. August. in Psal. lxxxvii.

‡ Quia homo assentiendo eis quæ sunt fidei elevatur supra naturam suam, oportet, quod hoc insit ei ex supernaturali principio interius movente, quod est Deus. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 6. A. 1. c. And your own divines agree in this, that *fides acquisita* is not sufficient for any article, but there must be *fides infusa* before there can be divine certainty. *Fides acquisita* innititur conjecturis hu-

manis. Ad quem modum et Saraceni suis præceptoribus, et Judæi suis rabinnis, et gentes suis philosophis, et omnes suis majoribus inhaerent: non sic Christiani, sed per interius lumen infusum a Spiritu Sancto, quo firmissime et certissime moventur ad credendum, &c. Canus, *Locor. lib. ii. c. 8. §. Jam si hæc.*

z “The Holy Ghost spake by the prophets,” &c. *Symb. Nicen. et i Pet. ii. 21.*—Quis modus est, quo doces animas ea quæ futura sunt? Docuisti enim prophetas tuos. S. August. *Confess. lib. xi. c. 19.*

a Nec enim ecclesiæ testimonium aut iudicium prædicamus, Dei Spiritum, vel ab ecclesia docente, vel a nobis audientibus, excludimus, sed utrobique disertè includimus, &c. *Stapl. Trip. cont. Whitak. c. 3.*

Sect. 16. not leave the church in general, nor the true members of it in particular, without grace to believe what himself had revealed and made credible:" so that faith, as it is taken for the virtue of faith, whether it be of this or any other article, "b though it receive a kind of preparation or occasion of beginning from the testimony of the church, as it proposeth and induceth to the faith, yet it ends in God, revealing within and teaching within that which the church preached without:" for till the Spirit of God move the heart of man, he cannot believe, be the object never so credible. The speech is true then, but quite c out of the state of this question, which inquires only after a sufficient means to make this object credible and fit to be believed against all impeachment of folly and temerity in belief, whether men do actually believe it or not; for which no man may expect inward private revelation without the external means of the church, unless perhaps the d case of necessity be excepted, when a man lives in such a time and place as excludes him from all ordinary means; in which I dare not offer to shut up God from the souls of men, nor to tie him to those ordinary ways and means to which yet in great wisdom and providence he hath tied and bound all mankind.

XII.—Private revelation then hath nothing ordinarily to do to make the object credible in this, that scripture is the word of God, or in any other article. For the question is of such outward and evident means as other men may take notice of as well as ourselves; by which, if there arise any doubting or infirmity in the faith, others may strengthen us, or we afford means to support them; whereas the "e testi-

b Fides quæ cepit ab ecclesie testimonio, quatenus proponit et inducit ad fidem, desinit in Deo intus revelante, et intus docente quod foris ecclesia prædicavit. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 3. A. 2.— "When grave and learned men do sometimes hold that of this principle there is no proof but by the testimony of the Spirit, &c. I think it is not their meaning to exclude all outward proofs, &c. but rather this, That all other means are uneffectual of themselves to work faith without the special grace of God," &c. Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. iii. §. 8.

c De habitu fidei quoad fieri ejus et generationem cum a Deo immediate

solo dono gratuito infusus est: nihil ad questionem: nisi, quoad hoc quod per scripturæ inspectionem, &c. Henr. a Gand. Sum. A. 10. q. 1. lit. D.

d Stapleton, Relect. Cont. 4. q. 3. A. 2, doth not only affirm it, but proves it too, a *paritate rationis*, in case of necessity, where there is no contempt of the external means.

e Quid cum singulis agitur, Deus scit qui agit, et ipsi cum quibus agitur, sciunt. Quid autem agatur cum genere humano, per historiam commendari voluit, et per prophetiam. S. August. de vera Relig. c. 25.

mony of the Spirit and all private revelation is within, nor felt nor seen of any but of him that hath it;" so that hence can be drawn no proof to others. And miracles are not sufficient alone to prove it, unless both they and the revelation too agree with the rule of scripture, which is now an unalterable rule by fman or angel. To all this A. C. says nothing, save that "I seem not to admit of an infallible impulsion of a private spirit *ex parte subjecti*, without any infallible reason, and that sufficiently applied *ex parte objecti*; which if I did admit would open a gap to all enthusiasms and dreams of fanatical men." Now for this yet I thank him; for I do not only "seem not to admit," but I do most clearly reject this phrensy in the words going before.

XIII.—4. The last way, which gives reason leave to come in and prove what it can, may not justly be denied by any reasonable man; for though reason without grace cannot see the way to heaven, nor believe this book in which God hath written the way, yet grace is never placed but in a reasonable creature, and proves, by the very seat which it hath taken up, that the end it hath is to be spiritual eye-water to make reason see what by <sup>h</sup>nature only it cannot, but never to blemish reason in that which it can comprehend. Now the use of reason is very general; and man (do what he can) is still apt to search and seek for a reason why he will believe, though after he once believes, his faith grows stronger than either his reason or his knowledge; and great reason for this,

f Gal. i. 8.

g Utitur tamen sacra doctrina ratione humana, non quidem ad probandum fidem ipsam, sed ad manifestandum aliqua alia, quæ traduntur in hac doctrina. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad 2 — Passibus rationis novus homo tendit in Deum. S. August. de vera Relig. c. 26. (Passibus, verum est, sed nec æquis, nec solis.)—Nam invisibilia Dei altiori modo quantum ad plura percipit fides, quam ratio naturalis ex creaturis in Deum procedens. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 2. A. 3. ad 3.

h Animalis homo non percipit. 1 Cor. ii. 14.

i Quia scientiæ certitudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanæ, quæ potest errare: theologia autem (quæ docet et objectum et notitiam fidei, sicut et fidem ipsam) certitudinem habet ex

lumine divini scientiæ, quæ decipi non potest. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 5. c.—Ut ipsa fide valentiores facti, quod credimus intelligere mereamur. S. August. cont. Ep. Manichæi, dictam Fundamentum, c. 14.—Hoc autem ita intelligendum est, ut scientia certior sit certitudine evidentiæ; fides vero certior firmitate adhesionis. Majus lumen in scientia, majus robur in fide. Et hoc, quia in fide, et ad fidem actus imperatus voluntatis concurrat. Credere enim est actus intellectus; vero assentientis productus ex voluntatis imperio. Biel. in 3. Sent. d. 23. q. 2. A. 1.—Unde Thom., Intellectus credentis determinatur ad unum, non per rationem, sed per voluntatem; et ideo assensus hic accipitur pro actu intellectus, secundum quod a voluntate determinatur ad unum. 2. 2æ. q. 2. A. 1. ad 3.

Sect. 16.  
A. C. p. 52.

Sect. 16. because it goes higher, and so upon a safer principle than either of the other can in this life.

XIV.—In this particular the books called the scripture are commonly and constantly reputed to be the word of God, and so, infallible verity to the least point of them. Doth any man doubt this? the world cannot keep him from going to weigh it at the balance of reason, whether it be the word of God or not. To the same weights he brings the tradition of the church, the inward motives in scripture itself, all testimonies within which seem to bear witness to it. And in all this there is no harm: the danger is when a man will use no other scale but reason, or prefer reason before any other scale: for the word of God and the book containing it refuse not to be weighed by <sup>k</sup>reason; but the scale is not large enough to contain, nor the weights to measure out the true virtue and full force of either. Reason then can give no supernatural ground into which a man may resolve his faith that scripture is the word of God infallibly; yet reason can go so high as it can prove that Christian religion which rests upon the authority of this book stands upon surer grounds of nature, reason, common equity, and justice, than any thing in the world which any infidel or mere naturalist hath done, doth, or can adhere unto against it, in that which he makes, accounts, or assumes as religion to himself.

XV.—The ancient Fathers relied upon the scriptures, no Christians more; and having to do with philosophers, (men very well seen in all the subtilties which natural reason could teach or learn,) they were often put to it, and did as often make it good, that they had sufficient warrant to rely so much as they did upon scripture. In all which disputes, because they were to deal with infidels, they did labour to make good the authority of the book of God by such arguments as unbelievers themselves could not but think reasonable, if they weighed them with indifferency. For though I set the mysteries of faith above reason, which is their proper place, yet I would have no man think they contradict reason or the principles thereof: no sure; for reason by her own

<sup>k</sup> Si vobis, rationi, et veritati consentanea videntur, in pretio habete, &c. Justin. Mart. de Mysteriis Religionis, Apol. 2.—Igitur, si fuit dispositio ratio-

nis, &c. Tertull. lib. de Carne Christi, c. 18.—Rationabile est credere Deum esse autorem scripturæ. Henr. a Gand. Sum. tom. i. Art. 9. q. 3.



light can discover how firmly the principles of religion are true, but all the light she hath will never be able to find them false. Nor may any man think that the principles of religion, even this, That the scriptures are the word of God, are so indifferent to a natural eye, that it may with as just cause lean to one part of the contradiction as to the other; for though this truth, That scripture is the word of God, is not so demonstratively evident *a priori* as to enforce assent, yet it is strengthened so abundantly with probable arguments, both from the light of nature itself and human testimony, that he must be very wilful and self-conceited that shall dare to suspect it.

XVI.—Nay, yet farther, “<sup>1</sup>It is not altogether impossible to prove it, even by reason, a truth infallible, or else to make them deny some apparent principle of their own.” For example; it is an apparent principle, and with them, That God, or the absolute, prime Agent, cannot be forced out of any possession; for if he could be forced by another greater, he were neither prince, nor absolute, nor <sup>m</sup>God, in their own theology. Now they must grant that that God and Christ which the scripture teaches and we believe is the only true God, and no other with him, and so deny the deity which they worshipped, or else deny their own principle about the Deity, That God cannot be commanded and forced out of possession. For “<sup>n</sup>their gods, Saturn, and Serapis, and Jupiter himself, have been adjured by the name of the true and only God, and have been forced out of the bodies they possessed, and confessed themselves to be foul and seducing devils: and their confession was to be supposed true in point of reason; for they that were adored as gods would never belie themselves into devils to their own reproach, especially in the presence of them that worshipped them, were they not forced.” This many of the unbelievers saw; therefore they could not (in

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. iii. §. 8.—Si Plato ipse viveret, et me interrogantem non aspernaretur, &c. S. August. de vera Relig. c. 3.—Videamus quatenus ratio potest progredi a visibilibus ad invisibilia, &c. Ibid. c. 29.

<sup>m</sup> Si vim spectes, Deus valentissimus est. Arist. de Mundo, c. 7.—Domini et moderatores omnium. Cic. de Leg. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Ipse Saturnus, et Serapis, et Jupi-

ter, et quicquid dæmonum colitis, victi dolore quod sunt, eloquuntur. Nec utique in turpitudinem sui nonnullis præsertim vestrorum assistentibus, mentiuntur. Ipsis testibus esse eos dæmones de se verum confitentibus credite. Adjurati enim per Deum verum, et solum inviti, &c. Arnob. contra Gent. 8, or Minutius Felix as is now thought.



Sect. 16. very force of reason) but they must either deny their god or deny their principle in nature. Their long custom would not forsake their god, and their reason could not forget their principle. If reason therefore might judge among them, they could not worship any thing that was under command: and if it be reasonable to do and believe this, then why not reasonable also to believe that scripture is his word, given to teach himself and Christ, since there they find Christ °doing that. and P giving power to do it after, which themselves saw executed upon their devil-gods?

XVII.—Besides, whereas all other written laws have scarce had the honour to be duly observed or constantly allowed worthy approbation in the particular places where they have been established for laws, this law of Christ, and this canon of scripture, the container of it, is or hath been received in almost ¶all nations under heaven: and wheresoever it hath been received, it hath been both approved for unchangeable good and believed for infallible verity. This persuasion could not have been wrought in men of all sorts but by working upon their reason, unless we shall think all the world unreasonable that received it: and certainly God did not give this admirable faculty of reasoning to the soul of man for any cause more prime than this, to discover or to judge and allow (within the sphere of its own activity, and not presuming farther) of the way to himself, when and howsoever it should be discovered.

XVIII.—One great thing that troubled rational men was that which stumbled the Manichee, (an heresy it was but more than half pagan,) namely, “That somewhat must be believed before much could be known.” Wise men use not to believe but what they know; and the Manichee †scorned the orthodox Christian as light of belief, promising to lead no disciple after him but upon evident knowledge. This stum-

° Matt. xii. 22.

p Matt. xvi. 17.

¶ Si libri quoquo modo se habent sancti tamen divinarum rerum pleni prope totius generis humani confessione diffamantur, &c. S. August. de Util. Cred. c. 7.—Scriptura summa dispositione providentiæ super omnes omnium gentium literas, omnia sibi genera ingeniorum humanorum divina excellens

authoritate subjeit. S. August. de Civ. Dei, xi. 1.—At in omni orbe terrarum, in omni Græcia, et universis nationibus, innumeri sunt, et immensi, qui relictis patriis legibus, &c. ad observantiam Mosis et Christi, &c. Origen. *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, iv. 1.

† Irridere in catholica fidei disciplina, quod juberentur homines credere, non autem, &c. S. August. *Retract.* i. 14.

bles many; but yet the principle, That somewhat must be Sect. 16.  
 believed before much can be known, stands firm in reason  
 still: for if in all sciences there be some principles which can-  
 not be proved; if reason be able to see this and confess it;  
 if almost all artists have granted it; if in the mathematics,  
 where are the exactest demonstrations, there be *quædam*  
*postulata*, some things to be first demanded and granted be-  
 fore the demonstration can proceed; who can justly deny  
 that to divinity, a science of the highest object, God himself,  
 which he easily and reasonably grants to inferior sciences,  
 which are more within his reach? And as all sciences suppose  
 some principles without proving, so have they almost all some  
 text, some authority upon which they rely in some measure:  
 and it is reason they should; for though these sciences make  
 not their texts infallible, as divinity doth, yet full consent,  
 and prudent examination, and long continuance, have won  
 reputation to them and settled reputation upon them very  
 deservedly. And were these texts more void of truth than  
 they are, yet it were fit and reasonable to uphold their credit,  
 that novices and young beginners in a science, which are not  
 able to work strongly upon reason, nor reason upon them,  
 may have authority to believe till they can learn to conclude  
 from principles, and so to know. Is this also reasonable in  
 other sciences, and shall it not be so in theology, to have a  
 text, a scripture, a rule, which novices may be taught first to  
 believe, that so they may after come to the knowledge of  
 those things which out of this rich principle and <sup>s</sup>treasure are  
 deducible? I yet see not how right reason can deny these  
 grounds: and if it cannot, then a mere natural man may be  
 thus far convinced that the text of God is a very credible  
 text.

XIX.—Well, these are the four ways by most of which  
 men offer to prove the scripture to be the word of God, as by  
 a divine and infallible warrant. And, it seems, no one of  
 these doth it alone. The tradition of the present church is

<sup>s</sup> And therefore St. Augustine, de  
 Doct. Christ. ii. 8, would have men  
 make themselves perfect in reading the  
 letter of the scripture even before they  
 understood it: *Eas notas habeat, etsi*  
*nondum intellectu, tamen lectione dun-*

*taxat*; no question but to make them  
 ready against they understood it; and  
 as schoolmasters make their scholars  
 con their grammar rules by heart, that  
 they may be ready for their use when  
 they better understand them.

Sect. 16. too weak, because that is not absolutely divine: the light which is in scripture itself is not bright enough, it cannot bear sufficient witness to itself: the testimony of the Holy Ghost, that is most infallible, but ordinarily it is not so much as considerable in this question, which is not how or by what means we believe, but how the scripture may be proposed as a credible object fit for belief: and for reason, no man expects that that should prove it; it doth service enough, if it enable us to disprove that which misguided men conceive against it. If none of these then be an absolute and sufficient means to prove it, either we must find out another, or see what can be more wrought out of these. And to all this again A. C. says nothing.

XX.—For the tradition of the church then, certain it is we must distinguish the church before we can judge right of the validity of the tradition: for if the speech be of the prime Christian church, the apostles, disciples, and such as had immediate revelation from heaven, no question but the voice and tradition of this church is divine, not *aliquo modo*, in a sort, but simply; and the word of God from them is of like validity written or delivered. And against this tradition (of which kind this, That the books of scripture are the word of God, is the most general and uniform) the church of England never excepted. And when <sup>1</sup>St. Augustine said, “I would not believe the gospel unless the authority of the catholic church moved me,” (which place you urged at the conference, though you are now content to slide by it,) some of your own will not endure should be understood save <sup>u</sup>of the church in the time of the apostles only, and <sup>x</sup>some of the church in general, not excluding afterages; but sure to include Christ and his apostles: and the certainty is there, abundance of certainty in itself; but how far that is evident to us shall after appear.

XXI.—But this will not serve your turn. The tradition of the present church must be as infallible as that of the

t Cont. Epis. Fund. lib. i. c. 5. Ego vero non crederem evangelio, nisi me catholice ecclesie commoveret autoritas.

u Intelligitur solum de ecclesia qua fuit tempore apostolorum. Ocham. Dial.

p. 1. lib. i. c. 4.

x Biel. lect. 22. in C. Missae. A tempore Christi et apostolorum, &c. And so doth St. Augustine take Eccles. contra Fund.

primitive: but the contrary to this is proved <sup>y</sup> before, because Sect. 16. this voice of the present church is not simply divine. To what end then serves any tradition of the present church? To what? why, to a very good end. For, first, it serves by a full consent to work upon the minds of unbelievers, to move them to read and to consider the scripture, which (they hear by so many wise, learned, and devout men) is of no meaner esteem than the word of God. And, secondly, it serves among novices, weaklings, and doubters in the faith, to instruct and confirm them, till they may acquaint themselves with and understand the scripture, which the church delivers as the word of God. And thus again some of your own understand the forecited place of St. Augustine, "I would not believe the gospel" &c.; <sup>z</sup> for he speaks it either of novices or doubters in the faith, or else of such as were in part infidels. You at the conference (though you omit it here) would needs have it that St. Augustine spake even of the <sup>a</sup> faithful, which I cannot yet think; for he speaks to the Manichees, and they had a great part of the infidel in them. And the words immediately before these are, "If thou shouldest find one, *qui evangelio nondum credit*, which did not yet believe the gospel, what wouldest thou do to make him believe?" <sup>b</sup> *Ego vero non*, "Truly I would not" &c. So to these two ends it serves, and there need be no question between us. But then, every thing that is the first inducer to believe is not by and by either the principal motive or the chief and last object of belief upon which a man may rest his faith; unless we shall be of <sup>c</sup> Jacobus Almain's opinion, that we are *per prius et*

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 16. num. VI.

<sup>z</sup> Sive infideles, sive in fide novitii. Canus, Loc. lib. ii. c. 8.—Neganti, aut omnino nescienti scripturam. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 1. A. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Quid si fateamur fideles etiam ecclesie autoritate commoveri, ut scripturas recipiant? non tamen inde sequitur eos hoc modo penitus persuaderi, aut nulla alia fortioreque ratione induci. Quis autem Christianus est, quem ecclesia Christi, commendans scripturam Christi, non commoveat? Whitak. Disp. de Sacra Scriptura, Cont. 1. q. 3. c. 8. ubi citat locum hunc S. August.

<sup>b</sup> Et ibid. Quibus obtemperavi dicentibus Credite evangelio Therefore

he speaks of himself when he did not believe.

<sup>c</sup> Certum est quod tenemur credere omnibus contentis in sacro canone, quia ecclesia credit ex ea ratione solum. Ergo per prius et magis tenemur credere ecclesie quam evangelio. Almain. in 3. Dist. 24. Conclus. 6. dub. 6. And, to make a show of proof for this, he falsifies St. Augustine most notoriously, and reads that known place, not *nisi me commoveret*, (as all read it,) but *compelleret*. Patet; quia dicit Augustinus, evangelio non crederem, nisi ad hoc me compelleret ecclesie autoritas. Ibid. And so also Gerson reads it, in Declarat. Veritatum quae credendae sunt, &c.

Sect. 16. *magis*, first and more bound to believe the church than the gospel; which your own learned men, as you may see by <sup>d</sup>Mel. Canus, reject as extreme foul, and so indeed it is. The first knowledge then (after the *quid nominis* is known by grammar) that helps to open a man's understanding, and prepares him to be able to demonstrate a truth and make it evident, is his logic; but when he hath made a demonstration, he resolves the knowledge of his conclusion, not into his grammatical or logical principles, but into the immediate principles out of which it is deduced. So in this particular, a man is probably led by the authority of the present church, as by the first informing, inducing, persuading means, to believe the scripture to be the word of God; but when he hath studied, considered, and compared this word with itself and with other writings, with the help of ordinary grace, and a mind morally induced and reasonably persuaded by the voice of the church, the scripture then gives greater and higher reasons of credibility to itself than tradition alone could give. And then he that believes resolves his last and full assent—that scripture is of divine authority—into internal arguments found in the letter itself, though found by the help and direction of tradition without and grace within: and the resolution that is rightly grounded may not endure to pitch and rest itself upon the helps, but upon that divine light which the scripture no question hath in itself, but is not kindled till these helps come. <sup>e</sup>*Thy word is a light*: so David. A light? therefore it is as much *manifestaticum sui* as *alterius*, a manifestation to itself as to other things which it shews; but still, not till the candle be lighted, not till there hath been a preparing instruction what light it is. Children call the sun and moon candles, God's candles; they see the light as well as men, but cannot distinguish between them till some tradition and education hath informed their reason: and <sup>f</sup>*animalis homo*, the natural man, sees some light of moral counsel and instruction in scripture as well as believers; but he takes all

part. i. p. 414. §. 3. But in a most ancient manuscript in Corpus Christi college library in Cambridge, the words are *nisi me commoveret*, &c.

<sup>d</sup> Canus, *Loc. lib. ii. c. 8 fol. 34. b.*  
—Sect. 16. num. VI.

<sup>e</sup> Psal. cxix. 105. Sanctarum scripturarum lumen. S. August. lib. de Vera Relig. c. 7.—*Quid lucem scripturarum vauis umbris?* &c. S. August. lib. de Mor. Eccl. Cathol. c. 35.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 14.



that glorious lustre for candlelight, and cannot distinguish Sect. 16. between the sun and twelve to the pound, till tradition of the church, and God's grace put to it, have cleared his understanding. So tradition of the present church is the first moral motive to belief; but the belief itself that the scripture is the word of God rests <sup>g</sup> upon the scripture, when a man finds it to answer and exceed all that which the church gave in testimony, as will after appear: and as in the voice of the primitive and apostolical church there was <sup>h</sup> simply divine authority delivering the scripture as God's word, so, after tradition of the present church hath taught and informed the soul, the voice of God is plainly heard in scripture itself. And then here is double authority, and both divine, that confirms scripture to be the word of God—tradition of the apostles delivering it, and the internal worth and argument in the scripture, obvious to a soul prepared by the present church's tradition and God's grace.

XXII.—The difficulties which are pretended against this are not many, and they will easily vanish. For, first, you pretend we go to private revelations for light to know scripture. No, we do not, you see it is excluded out of the very state of the question; and we go to the tradition of the present church, and by it, as well as you. Here we differ: we use the tradition of the present church as the first motive, not as the last resolution of our faith; we resolve only into <sup>i</sup> prime tradition apostolical and scripture itself.

XXIII.—Secondly, you pretend we do not nor cannot know the prime apostolical tradition but by the tradition of the present church; and that, therefore, if the tradition of the present church be not God's unwritten word, and divine, we cannot yet know scripture to be scripture by a divine authority. Well, suppose I could not know the prime tra-

<sup>g</sup> Origen, *περὶ ἀρχῶν* l. iv. c. 1, went this way, yet was he a great deal nearer the prime tradition than we are; for being to prove that the scriptures were inspired from God, he saith, *De hoc assignabimus ex ipsis divinis scripturis, quæ nos competenter moverint, &c.*

<sup>h</sup> *Principaliter tamen (etiam et hic) credimus propter Deum, non apostolos, &c.* *Henr. a Gand. Sum. A. 9. q. 3.* Now if, where the apostles themselves

spake, *ultima resolutio fidei* was in *Deum*, not in *ipsos per se*, much more shall it be in *Deum* than in *præsentem ecclesiam*, and into the writings of the apostles than into the words of their successors made up into a tradition.

<sup>i</sup> *Christiana ecclesia prophetarum scriptis et apostolorum prædicatione initio fundata fuit, ubicunque reperietur ea doctrina, &c.* *Calv. Institut. l. i. c. 5. §. 2.*



Sect. 16. dition to be divine but by the present church; yet it doth not follow that therefore I cannot know scripture to be the word of God by a divine authority, because divine tradition is not the sole and only means to prove it: for suppose I had not nor could have full assurance of apostolical tradition divine, yet the moral persuasion, reason, and force of the present church, is ground enough to move any reasonable man that it is fit he should read the scripture, and esteem very reverently and highly of it; and this once done, the scripture hath then in and home arguments enough to put a soul, that hath but ordinary grace, out of doubt that scripture is the word of God, infallible and divine.

XXIV.—Thirdly, you pretend that we make the scripture absolutely and fully to be known *lumine suo*, by the light and testimony which it hath in and gives to itself. Against this you give reason for yourselves and proof from us. Your reason is, “If there be sufficient light in scripture to shew itself, then every man that can and doth but read it may know it presently to be the divine word of God, which we see by daily experience men neither do nor can.” First, it is not absolutely nor universally true. There is <sup>k</sup>sufficient light, therefore every man may see it: blind men are men, and cannot see it; and <sup>l</sup>sensual men, in the apostle’s judgment, are such: nor may we deny and put out this light as insufficient because blind eyes cannot and perverse eyes will not see it, no more than we may deny meat to be sufficient for nourishment, though men that are heart-sick cannot eat it. Next, we do not say that there is such a full light in scripture as that every man upon the first sight must yield to it, such light as is found in prime principles; “Every whole is greater than a part of the same;” and this, “The same thing cannot be and not be at the same time and in the same respect.” These carry a natural light with them, and evident; for the terms are no sooner understood than the principles themselves are fully known, to the convincing of man’s understanding, and so they are the beginning of knowledge; which, where it is perfect, dwells in full light: but such a full light we do neither

<sup>k</sup> And where Hooker uses this very argument, as he doth b. iii. §. 8, his words are not, “If there be *sufficient* light,” but, “if that light be *evident*.”

<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 14.

say is, nor require to be in scripture; and if any particular <sup>Sect. 16.</sup> man do, let him answer for himself. The question is only of such a light in scripture as is of force to breed faith that it is the word of God, not to make a perfect knowledge. Now faith, of whatsoever it is, this or other principle, is an <sup>m</sup> evidence as well as knowledge, and the belief is firmer than any knowledge can be, because it rests upon divine authority, which cannot deceive; whereas knowledge (or at least he that thinks he knows) is not ever certain in deductions from principles. <sup>n</sup> But the evidence is not so clear; for it is <sup>o</sup> of things not seen, in regard of the object; and in regard of the subject that sees, it is <sup>p</sup> in *enigmate*, in a glass or dark speaking. Now God doth not require a full demonstrative knowledge in us that the scripture is his word, and therefore in his providence hath kindled in it no light for that; but he requires our faith of it, and such a certain demonstration as may fit that: and for that he hath left sufficient light in scripture to reason and grace meeting, where the soul is morally prepared by the tradition of the church; unless you be of <sup>q</sup> Bellarmine's opinion, "That to believe there are any divine scriptures is not *omnino* necessary to salvation."

<sup>m</sup> Ἐλεγχος. Heb. xi. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Sect. 16. num. XIII.

<sup>o</sup> Heb. xi. 1.

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 12. And A. C. confesses, p. 52, that this very thing in question may be known infallibly when it is known but obscurely. Et Scotus in 3. Dist. 23. q. 1. fol. 41. B. Hoc modo facile est videre, quomodo fides est cum enigmate et obscuritate. Quia habitus fidei non credit articulum esse verum ex evidentia objecti, sed propter hoc quod assentit veritati infundentis habitum, et in hoc revelantis credibilia.

<sup>q</sup> Credere ullas esse divinas scripturas, non est omnino necessarium ad salutem. Bellarm. de Eccles. lib. iii. c. 14. I will not break my discourse to rifle this speech of Bellarmine; it is bad enough in the best sense that favour itself can give it. For if he mean by *omnino* that it is not *altogether* or *simply* necessary to believe there is divine scripture and a written word of God, that is false, that being granted which is among all Christians, that there is a scripture: and God would never have given a supernatural unnecessary thing.

And if he means by *omnino* that it is not *in any wise* necessary, then it is sensibly false; for the greatest upholders of tradition that ever were made the scripture very necessary in all the ages of the church. So it was necessary because it was given, and given because God thought it necessary. Besides, upon Roman grounds, this, I think, will follow: 'That which the tradition of the present church delivers as necessary to believe, is *omnino* necessary to salvation; but that there are divine scriptures, the tradition of the present church delivers as necessary to believe: therefore, to believe there are divine scriptures is *omnino* (be the sense of the word what it can) necessary to salvation. So Bellarmine is herein foul, and unable to stand upon his own ground; and he is the more, partly because he avouches this proposition for truth after the New Testament written, and partly because he might have seen the state of this proposition carefully examined by Gandavo, and distinguished by times. Sum. p. 1. A. 8. q. 4. fine.

Sect. 16. XXV.—The authority which you pretend against this is out of <sup>r</sup>Hooker: “Of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know what books we are bound to esteem holy; which point is confessed impossible for the scripture itself to teach.” Of this <sup>s</sup>Brerely (the storehouse for all priests that will be idle and yet seem well read) tells us that “<sup>t</sup>Hooker gives a very sensible demonstration: ‘It is not the word of God which doth or possibly can assure us that we do well to think it is his word; for if any one book of scripture did give testimony to all, yet still that scripture which giveth credit to the rest would require another to give credit unto it; nor could we ever come to any pause to rest our assurance this way: so that unless, beside scripture, there were something that might assure,’” &c. And “<sup>u</sup>this he acknowledgeth,” saith Brerely, “is the authority of God’s church.” Certainly Hooker gives a true and a sensible demonstration; but Brerely wants fidelity and integrity in citing him; for, in the first place, Hooker’s speech is, “Scripture itself cannot teach this;” nor can the truth say that scripture itself can; it must needs ordinarily have tradition to prepare the mind of a man to receive it. And in the next place, where he speaks so sensibly, that scripture cannot bear witness to itself, nor one part of it to another, that is grounded upon nature, which admits no created thing to be witness to itself, and is acknowledged by our Saviour; <sup>x</sup>*If I bear witness to myself, my witness is not true*, that is, is not of force to be reasonably accepted for truth. But then it is more than manifest that Hooker delivers his demonstration of scripture alone; for if scripture hath another proof, nay, many other proofs to usher it and lead it in, then no question it can both prove and approve itself. His words are, “So that unless, besides scripture, there be” &c. “Besides scripture;” therefore he excludes not scripture, though he call for another proof to lead it in, and help in assurance, namely, tradition, which no man that hath his brains about him denies. In the two other places Brerely falsifies shamefully; for, folding up all that Hooker says in these words, “This (other means to assure us besides

<sup>r</sup> B. i. §. 14.

<sup>s</sup> Protest. Apol. Tract. 1. §. 10. n. 3.

<sup>t</sup> B. ii. §. 4.

<sup>u</sup> B. ii. §. 7. and b. iii. §. 8.

<sup>x</sup> John v. 31; he speaks of himself as man. John viii. 13.

scripture) is the authority of God's church," he wrinkles that Sect. 16. worthy author desperately, and shrinks up his meaning. For in the former place abused by Brerely, no man can set a better state of the question between scripture and tradition than Hooker doth: his words are these; "yThe scripture is the ground of our belief; the authority of man (that is the name he gives to tradition) is the key which opens the door of entrance into the knowledge of the scripture." I ask now, When a man is entered and hath viewed a house, and upon viewing likes it, and upon liking resolves unchangeably to dwell there, doth he set up his resolution upon the key that let him in? No sure, but upon the goodness and commodiousness which he sees in the house. And this is all the difference (that I know) between us in this point; in which do you grant (as you ought to do) that we resolve our faith into scripture as the ground, and we will never deny that tradition is the key that lets us in. In the latter place Hooker is as plain as constant to himself and truth: his words are; "zThe first outward motive leading men so to esteem of the scripture is the authority of God's church," &c. "But afterwards, the more we bestow our labour in reading or learning the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it; so that the former inducement, prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministered further reason." Here then again, in his judgment, tradition is the first inducement, but the further reason and ground is the scripture. And resolution of faith ever settles upon the furthest reason it can, not upon the first inducement. So that the state of this question is firm, and yet plain enough to him that will not shut his eyes.

XXVI.—Now here, after a long silence, A. C. thrusts him- A. C. p. 52. self in again, and tells me, "That if I would consider the tradition of the church, not only as it is the tradition of a company of fallible men, in which sense the authority of it (as himself confesses) is but human and fallible, &c., but as the tradition of a company of men assisted by Christ and his Holy Spirit; in that sense I might easily find it more than

Sect. 16. an introduction; indeed, as much as would amount to an infallible motive." Well, I have considered the tradition of the present church both these ways; and I find that A. C. confesses that in the first sense the tradition of the church is mere human authority, and no more; and therefore, in this sense, it may serve for an introduction to this belief, but no more: and in the second sense, as it is not the tradition of a company of men only, but of men assisted by Christ and his Spirit; in this second sense I cannot find that the tradition of the present church is of divine and infallible authority, till A. C. can prove that this company of men (the Roman prelates and their clergy he means) are so fully, so clearly, so permanently assisted by Christ and his Spirit, as may reach to infallibility, to a divine infallibility, in this or any other principle which they teach: for every assistance of Christ and the blessed Spirit is not enough to make the authority of any company of men divine and infallible, but such and so great an assistance only as is purposely given to that effect. Such an assistance the prophets under the old testament and the apostles under the new had; but neither the high priest with his clergy in the old, nor any company of prelates or priests in the new, since the apostles, ever had it. And

A. C. p. 52. therefore, though at the entreaty of A. C. I have considered this very well, yet I cannot, no, not in this assisted sense, think the tradition of the present church divine and infallible, or "such company of men to be worthy of divine and infallible credit, and sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith;"

A. C. p. 52. which I am sorry A. C. should affirm so boldly as he doth. What! that company of men (the Roman bishop and his clergy) of divine and infallible credit, and sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith! Good God! whither will these men go? Surely they are *wise in their generation*, but that makes them never a whit the more the <sup>a</sup>*children of light*. And could they put this home upon the world, (as they are gone far in it,) what might they not effect! How might they and would they then lord it over the faith of Christendom, contrary to <sup>b</sup>St. Peter's rule, (whose successors certainly in this they are not.) But I pray, if this company of men be

<sup>a</sup> Luke xvi. 8.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Pet. v. 3.



infallibly assisted, whence is it that this very company have Sect. 16. erred so dangerously as they have, not only in some other things, but even in this particular, by equaling the tradition of the present church to the written word of God? which is a doctrine unknown to the <sup>c</sup>primitive church, and which frets upon the very foundation itself by justling with it. So, belike, he that hath but half an indifferent eye may see this assisted company have erred, and yet we must wink in obedience and think them infallible.

XXVII.—But A. C. would have me consider again, “That A. C. p. 52. it is as easy to take the tradition of the present church in the two forenamed senses, as the present scriptures printed and approved by men of this age: for in the first sense, the very scriptures,” saith he, “considered as printed and approved by men of this age, can be no more than of human credit; but in the second sense, as printed and approved by men assisted by God’s Spirit, for true copies of that which was first written, then we may give infallible credit to them.” Well, I have considered this too; and I can take the printing and approving the copies of holy writ in these two senses; and I can and do make a difference between copies printed and approved by mere moral men, and men assisted by God’s Spirit. And yet for the printing only, a skilful and an able moral man may do better service to the church than an illiterate man, though assisted in other things by God’s Spirit. But when I have considered all this, what then? the scripture, being put in writing, is a thing visibly existent; and if any error be in the print, it is easily corrigible by <sup>d</sup>former copies. Tradition is not so easily observed, nor so safely kept. And, howsoever, to come home to that which A. C. A. C. p. 53.

<sup>c</sup> St. Basil goes as far for traditions as any; for he says, *Parem vim habent ad pietatem. L. de Sp. Sanct. c. 27.* But first, he speaks of apostolical tradition, not of the tradition of the present church. Secondly, the learned take exceptions to this book of St. Basil, as corrupted. *Bp. Andr. Opusc. cont. Peron. p. 9.* Thirdly, St. Basil himself, *Serm. de Fide*, professes that he uses sometimes *agrapha*, sed ea solum quæ non sunt aliena a pia secundum scripturam sententia. So he makes the scripture their touchstone or trial; and

therefore must of necessity make scripture superior, inasmuch as that which is able to try another is of greater force and superior dignity in that use than the thing tried by it. And Stapleton himself confesses, *Traditionem recentiorem et posteriorem, sicut et particularem, nullo modo eum scriptura, vel eum traditionibus prius a se explicatis comparandam esse. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 5. q. 5. A. 2.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ut §. 18. num. IV.; ex S. August. cont. Faust. lib. xxxii. c. 16.*



Sect. 16. infers upon it, namely, "That the tradition of the present church may be accepted in these two senses:" and if this be all that he will infer, (for his pen here is troubled and forsakes him, whether by any check of conscience or no, I know not.) I will, and you see, have granted it already, without more ado, with this caution, that every company of men assisted by God's Spirit are not assisted to this height, to be infallible by divine authority.

A. C. p. 53. XXVIII.—For all this A. C. will needs give a needless proof of the business; namely, "That there is the promise of Christ's and his Holy Spirit's continual presence and assistance, Luke x. 16. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. John xiv. 16, not only to the apostles, but to their successors also, the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the church in all ages; and that this promise is no less, but rather more expressly to them in their preaching by word of mouth, than in writing, or reading, or printing, or approving of copies of what was formerly written by the apostles." And to all this I shall briefly say, that there is a promise of Christ's and the Holy Spirit's continual presence and assistance. I do likewise grant most freely that this promise is, on the part of Christ and the Holy Ghost, most really and fully performed. But then this promise must not be extended further than it was made. It was made of continual presence and assistance; that I grant: and it was made to the apostles and their successors; that I grant too, but in a different degree; for it was of continual and infallible assistance to the apostles, but to their successors of continual and fitting assistance, but not infallible. And therefore the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the church in all ages have had and shall have continual assistance, but, by A. C.'s leave, not infallible, at least, not divine and infallible, either in writing, reading, printing, or approving copies. And I believe A. C. is the first that durst affirm this: I thought he would have kept the pope's prerogative entire, that he only might have been infallible; and not he neither, but *in cathedra* sat down and well advised. And well advised—yes, that is right: <sup>e</sup>but he may be sat, and

<sup>e</sup> Nam multe sunt decretales hæreticæ, sicut dicit Ocham. Et firmiter hoc credo, sed non licet dogmatizare oppositum, quoniam sunt determinatæ,

nisi manifeste constet, &c. Ja. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. unica, Conclus. 6. Dub. 6. fine. And Alphons. a Castro both says and proves, Cælestinum pa-

not well advised, even *in cathedra*. And now shall we have Sect. 16. all the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of that church in all ages infallible too? Here is a deal of infallibility indeed, and yet error store. The truth is, the Jesuits have a month's mind to this infallibility; and though A. C. out of his bounty is content to extend it to all the lawfully sent pastors of the church, yet to his own society, questionless, he means it chiefly; as did the apologist to whom Casaubon replies, to Fronto Ducæus. The words of the apologist are, "Let day and night—life and death, be joined together, and then there will be some hope that heresy may fall upon the person of a Jesuit." Yea, marry, this is something indeed; now we know where infallibility is to be found. But, for my present occasion, touching the lawfully sent pastors of the church, &c. I will give no other confutation of it than that Mr. Fisher and A. C. (if they be two men) are lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the church; at least, I am sure they will assume they are; and yet they are not infallible, which, I think, appears plain enough in some of their errors manifested by this discourse and elsewhere. Or if they do hold themselves infallible, let them speak it out, as the apologist did.

XXIX.—As for the three places of scripture which A. C. A. C. p. 53. cites, they are of old alleged, and well known in this controversy. The first is in St. Luke x., where Christ saith, *εἰ ἡε that heareth you heareth me*. This was absolutely true in the apostles, who kept themselves to that which was revealed by Christ: but it was to be but conditionally true in their successors; *He that heareth you heareth me*; that is, so long

pam errasse, non ut privatam personam, sed ut papam. Adv. Hær. lib. i. c. 4. And the Gloss confesses, eum errare posse, in C. 24. q. 1. C. A. Recta ergo.

f Nam in fide quidem Jesuitam errare non posse, atque adeo esse hoc unicum τῶν ἀδυνάτων, cæteris, quæ solent a poetis plurima commemorari, posthac annunerandum, si nescis, mi Fronto, et puto nescire, docebo te, ab apologista doctus, hoc ipsum disertis verbis affirmante. Sic ille cap. 3. ejus exemplaris quod ad sereniss. regem fuit missum, pagina 119; "Jungantur in unum," ait, "dies cum nocte, tenebræ cum luce, calidum cum frigido, sanitas cum morbo, vita cum morte: et erit tum spes aliqua posse in caput Jesuitæ

hæresin cadere." Isa. Casaubon. Ep. ad Front. Ducæum. Lond. 1611.

g Luke x. 16.

h Per quod docet quicquid per sanctos apostolos dicitur acceptandum esse, quia qui illos audit Christum audit, &c. S. Cyrillus apud Thom. in Catena.—Et Dominus dedit apostolis suis potestatem evangelii, per quos et veritatem, id est, Dei Filium, cognovimus, &c. Quibus et dixit Dominus, *Qui vos audit*, &c. Iren. præf. in lib. iii. adv. Hær. fine.

i Dicit ad apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos, qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt. S. Cyprian. lib. iv. epist. 9. But St. Cyprian doth not say that this speech of our Saviour's was *æqualiter dictum*, alike and equally

Sect. 16. and so far as you speak my words, and not your own. For<sup>k</sup> where the command is for preaching, the restraint is added: *Go* (saith Christ) *and teach all nations*: but you may not preach all things what you please, but *all things which I have commanded you*: the publication is yours, the doctrine is mine; and where the doctrine is not mine, there your publication is beyond or short of your commission. The second place is in St. Matth. xxviii. There Christ says again, <sup>l</sup>*I am with you alway even unto the end of the world*. Yes, most certain it is, present by his Spirit; for else in bodily presence he continued not with his apostles but during his abode on earth. And this promise of his spiritual presence was to their successors, else why *to the end of the world*? the apostles did not, could not, live so long: but then to the<sup>m</sup> successors the promise goes no further than *I am with you always*; which reaches to continual assistance, but not to divine and infallible. Or if he think me mistaken, let him shew me any one Father of the church that extends the sense of this place to divine and infallible assistance granted hereby to all the apostles' successors. Sure I am<sup>n</sup> St. Gregory thought otherwise; for he says plainly, "That in those gifts of God which concern other men's salvation, (of which preaching of the gospel is one,) the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Ghost, doth not always abide in the preachers," be they never so lawfully sent pastors or doctors of the church. And if the Holy Ghost

spoken and promised to the apostles and the succeeding bishops. And I believe A. C. will not dare to say, in plain and express terms, that this speech, *He that heareth you heareth me*, doth as amply belong to every Roman priest as to St. Peter and the apostles: no, a great deal of difference will become them well.

<sup>i</sup> *Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ*, 1 Cor. xi. 1. and 1 Thess. i. 6.

<sup>j</sup> And so Venerable Bede expressly, both for hearing the word, and for condemning it. "For neither of these," saith he, "belong only to them which saw our Saviour in the flesh, but to all *hodie quoque*; but with this limitation, if they hear or despise *evangelii verba*, not the preachers' own." Bede in Luc. x. 15, 16.

<sup>k</sup> Matt. xxviii. 20.

<sup>l</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

<sup>m</sup> Rabanus Maur. goes no further

than that to the end some will always be in the world fit for Christ by his Spirit and grace to inhabit, *Divina mansione et inhabitatione digni*. Rab. in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. *Pergatis habentes Dominum protectorem et ducem*, saith St. Cyprian, lib. iv. epist. 1. but he doth not say how far forth. And, *Loquitur fidelibus sicut uni corpori*. S. Chrysost. Homil. in S. Matth. And if St. Chrysostom enlarge it so far, I hope A. C. will not extend the assistance given or promised here to the whole body of the faithful to an infallible and divine assistance in every of them, as well as in the pastors and doctors.

<sup>n</sup> In illis donis quibus salus aliorum quaeritur (qualia sunt prophetiae, et interpretationes sermonum, &c.) Spiritus Sanctus nequaquam semper in praedicatoribus permanet. S. Greg. Moral. lib. ii. c. 29. princ. edit. Basil. 1551.

doth not always abide in the preachers, then most certainly Sect. 16.  
 he doth not abide in them to a divine infallibility always.  
 The third place is in St. John xiv., where Christ says, ° *The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, shall abide with you for ever.* Most true again; for the Holy Ghost did abide with the apostles according to Christ's promise there made, and shall abide with their successors for ever, to comfort and preserve them. But here is no promise of divine infallibility made unto them. And for that promise which is made, and expressly of infallibility, ¶ St. John xvi. (though not cited by A. C.), that is confined to the apostles only, for the settling of them in all truth. And yet not simply *all*; for "there are some truths," saith † St. Augustine, "which no man's soul can comprehend in this life:" not simply *all*; but § all those truths *quæ non poterant portare*, which they were not able to bear when he conversed with them: not simply *all*; but all that was necessary for the founding, propagating, establishing and confirming the Christian church. But if any man take the boldness to enlarge this promise in the fulness of it beyond the persons of the apostles themselves, that will fall out which † St. Augustine hath in a manner prophesied; every heretic will shelter himself and his vanities under this colour of infallible verity.

XXX.—I told you a ¶ little before that A. C. his pen was A. C. p. 52.  
 troubled, and failed him; therefore I will help to make out his inference for him, that his cause may have all the strength it can. And (as I conceive) this is that he would have; The tradition of the present church is as able to work in us divine and infallible faith that the scripture is the word of God, as that the Bible (or books of scripture) now printed and in use is a true copy of that which was first written by

° John xiv. 16.

¶ Iste consolator non auferetur a vobis, sicut subtrahitur humanitas mea per mortem, sed æternaliter erit vobiscum, hic per gratiam, in futuro per gloriam. Lyra in S. Joh. xiv. 16. You see there the Holy Ghost shall be present by consolation and grace, not by infallible assistance.

¶ John xvi. 13.

† Omnem veritatem: non arbitror in hac vita in cujusquam mente compleri, &c. S. August. in S. Joh. Tract. 96. versus fin.

§ Spiritus Sanctus, &c. qui eos doceret omnem veritatem, quam tunc, cum iis loquebatur, portare non poterant. S. Joh. xvi. 12, 13. et S. August. in S. Joh. Tract. 97. princ.

† Omnes vel insipientissimi hæretici, qui se Christianos vocari volunt, audacius figmentorum suorum, quas maxime exhorret sensus humanus, hac occasione evangelicæ sententiæ colorare conentur, &c. S. August. in S. Joh. Tract. 97. circa med.

¶ Num. XXVI.

Sect. 16. the penmen of the Holy Ghost, and delivered to the church. It is most true the tradition of the present church is alike operative and powerful in and over both these works, but neither divine nor infallible in either. But as it is the first moral inducement to persuade that scripture is the word of God, so is it also the first, but moral still, that the Bible we now have is a true copy of that which was first written. But then as in the former, so in this latter for the true copy, the last resolution of our faith cannot possibly rest upon the naked tradition of the present church, but must by and with it go higher to other helps and assurances. Where I hope A. C. will confess we have greater helps to discover the truth or falsehood of a copy, than we have means to look into a tradition. Or especially to sift out this truth, that it was a divine and infallible revelation by which the originals of scripture were first written; that being far more the subject of this inquiry than the copy, which, according to art and science, may be examined by former preceding copies close up to the very apostles' times.

A. C. p. 53. XXXI.—But A. C. hath not done yet; for in the last place he tells us, “That tradition and scripture, without any vicious circle, do mutually confirm the authority either of other.” And truly, for my part, I shall easily grant him this, so he will grant me this other; namely, that though they do mutually, yet they do not equally confirm the authority either of other. For scripture doth infallibly confirm the authority of church traditions truly so called; but tradition doth but morally and probably confirm the authority of the scripture. And this is manifest by A. C.'s own similitude: “for,” saith he, “it is as a king's ambassador's word of mouth and his king's letters bear mutual witness to each other.” Just so, indeed. For his king's letters of credence under hand and seal confirm the ambassador's authority infallibly to all that know seal and hand: but the ambassador's word of mouth confirms his king's letters but only probably. For else, why are they called letters of credence, if they give not him more credit than he can give them? But that which follows I cannot approve, to wit, “That the lawfully sent preachers of the gospel are God's legates, and the scriptures God's letters, which he hath appointed his legates to deliver and expound.”



So far it is well, but here is the sting: "That these letters do warrant, that the people may hear and give credit to these legates of Christ, as to Christ the King himself." Soft, this is too high a great deal. No <sup>v</sup> legate was ever of so great credit as the king himself. Nor was any priest, never so lawfully sent, ever of that authority as Christ himself; no sure, for *ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am*<sup>x</sup>, saith our Saviour, St. John xiii. And certainly this did not suddenly drop out of A. C.'s pen. For he told us A. C. p. 52. once before, "That this company of men which deliver the present church's tradition (that is, the lawfully sent preachers of the church) are assisted by God's Spirit to have in them divine and infallible authority, and to be worthy of divine and infallible credit, sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith." Why, but is it possible these men should go thus far to defend an error, be it never so dear unto them? They as Christ! Divine and infallible authority in them! Sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith! I have often heard some wise men say, that the Jesuit in the church of Rome and the precise party in the reformed churches agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one; for both of them differ extremely about tradition: the one in magnifying it, and exalting it into divine authority; the other vilifying and depressing it almost beneath human. And yet even in these different ways both agree in this consequent, That the sermons and preachings by word of mouth of the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the church are able to breed in us divine and infallible faith: nay, are the <sup>y</sup>very word of God. So A. C. expressly. And no less than so have some accounted of their own factious words, to say no more, than as the <sup>z</sup>word of God. I ever took sermons, and so do still, to be most necessary expositions and applications of

<sup>v</sup> Will A. C. maintain that any legate *a Latere* is of as great credit as the pope himself?

<sup>x</sup> John xiii. 13.

<sup>y</sup> For this A. C. says expressly of tradition, p. 52. And then he adds, "that the promise for this was no less, but rather more expressly, made to the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the

church in all ages, in their teaching by word of mouth, than in writing," &c. p. 53.

<sup>z</sup> For the freeing of factious and silenced ministers is termed the "restoring of God's word to its liberty," in the godly author of the late *News* from Ipswich, p. 5.



Sect. 16. holy scripture, and a great ordinary means of saving knowledge. But I cannot think them or the preachers of them divinely infallible. The ancient Fathers of the church preached far beyond any of these of either faction; and yet no one of them durst think himself infallible, much less that whatsoever he preached was the word of God. And it may be observed too, that no men are more apt to say that all the Fathers were but men and might err, than they that think their own preachings are infallible.

XXXII.—The next thing, after this large interpretation of A. C., which I shall trouble you with, is, that this method and manner of proving scripture to be the word of God, which I here use, is the same which the ancient church ever held, namely, tradition, ecclesiastical authority, first; and then all other arguments, but especially internal, from the scripture itself. This way the church went in St. Augustine's time<sup>a</sup>. He was no enemy to church tradition; yet when he would prove that the author of the scripture, and so of the whole knowledge of divinity as it is supernatural, is *Deus in Christo*, God in Christ, he takes this as the all-sufficient way, and gives four proofs, all internal to the scripture: first, the miracles; secondly, "That there is nothing carnal in the doctrine;" thirdly, "That there hath been such performance of it;" fourthly, "That by such a doctrine of humility the whole world almost hath been converted." And whereas *ad muniendam fidem*, for the defending of the faith and keeping it entire, there are two things requisite, scripture and church tradition, <sup>b</sup>Vincentius Lirinensis places authority of scriptures first, and then tradition. And since it is apparent that tradition is first in order of time, it must necessarily follow that scripture is first in order of nature, that is, the chief upon which faith rests and resolves itself. And your own school confesses this was the

<sup>a</sup> And St. Augustine himself, contra Faust. lib. xiii. c. 5, proves by an internal argument the fulfilling of the prophets. Scriptura (saith he) quæ fidem suam rebus ipsis probat quæ per temporum successiones hæc impleri, &c. And Henr. a Gand., par. i. Sum. A. 9. q. 3, cites St. Augustine's book de Vera

Religione; in which book though these four arguments are not found in terms together, yet they fill up the scope of the whole book.

<sup>b</sup> Duplici modo muniiri fidem, &c. Primo divinæ legis autoritate, tum deinde ecclesiæ catholicæ traditione. Cont. Hær. c. 1.

way ever. The woman of <sup>c</sup>Samaria is a known resemblance, but allowed by yourselves; “for <sup>d</sup>*quotidie*, daily with them that are without, Christ enters by the woman, that is, the church, and they believe by that fame which she gives,” &c. But when they come to hear Christ himself, they believe his word before the words of the woman. For when they have once found Christ, “<sup>e</sup>they do more believe his words in scripture than they do the church which testifies of him; because then *propter illam*, for the scripture they believe the church; and if the church should speak contrary to the scripture, they would not believe it.” Thus the school taught then; and thus the gloss commented then; and when men have tired themselves, hither they must come. The key that lets men into the scriptures, even to this knowledge of them, that they are the word of God, is the tradition of the church; but when they are in, <sup>f</sup>“they hear Christ himself immediately speaking in scripture to the faithful; <sup>g</sup>and his sheep do not only hear but know his voice.” And then here is no vicious circle indeed of proving the scripture by the church, and then roundabout, the church by the scripture. Only distinguish the times and the conditions of men, and all is safe. For a beginner in the faith, or a weakling, or a doubter about it, begins at tradition, and proves scripture by the church; but a man strong and grown up in the faith, and understandingly conversant in the word of God, proves the church by the scripture: and then upon the matter we have a double divine testimony altogether infallible, to confirm unto us that scripture is the word of God. The first is the tradition of the church of the apostles themselves, who delivered immediately to the world the word of Christ: the other, the scripture itself, but after it hath received this testimony. And into these we do and

<sup>c</sup> John iv.

<sup>d</sup> Henr. a Gand. Sum. par. i. A. 10. q. 1. Sic quotidie apud illos qui foris sunt, intrat Christus per mulierem, i. e. ecclesiam, et credunt per istam famam, &c. Gloss. in S. Joh. cap. 4.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. Plus verbis Christi in scriptura credit, quam ecclesie testificanti; quia propter illam jam credit ecclesie. Et si ipsa quidem contraria scripturae diceret, ipsi non crederet, &c.—Primam

fidem tribuamus scripturis canonicis, secundam, sub ista, definitionibus et consuetudinibus ecclesie catholice, post istas studiosis viris non sub pena perfidia, sed protervie, &c. Walden. Doct. Fid. tom. i. lib. ii. Art. 2. c. 23. num. 9.

<sup>f</sup> In sacra scriptura ipse immediate loquitur fidelibus. Ibid.

<sup>g</sup> John x. 4.

Sect. 16. may safely resolve our faith. “<sup>h</sup>As for the tradition of afterages, in and about which miracles and divine power were not so evident, we believe them (by Gandavo’s full confession) because they do not preach other things than those former (the apostles) left in *scriptis certissimis*, in most certain scripture. And it appears by men in the middle ages, that these writings were vitiated in nothing, by the concordant consent in them of all succeeders to our own time.”

XXXIII.—And now by this time it will be no hard thing to reconcile the Fathers, which seem to speak differently in no few places, both one from another, and the same from themselves, touching scripture and tradition; and that as well in this point, to prove scripture to be the word of God, as for concordant exposition of scripture in all things else. When therefore the Fathers say, “<sup>i</sup>We have the scriptures by tradition,” or the like; either they mean the tradition of the apostles themselves delivering it, and there, when it is known to be such, we may resolve our faith; or if they speak of the present church, then they mean, that the tradition of it is that by which we first receive the scripture, as by an according means to the prime tradition. But because it is not simply divine, we cannot resolve our faith into it, nor settle our faith upon it, till it resolve itself into the prime tradition of the apostles, or the scripture, or both; and there we rest with it. And you cannot shew an ordinary consent of Fathers; nay, can you or any of your quarter shew any one Father of the church, Greek or Latin, that ever said, We are to resolve our faith that scripture is the word of God into the tradition of the present church? And again, when the Fathers say we are to rely upon scripture <sup>k</sup>only, they are never to be understood with exclusion of tradition, in what causes soever it may be had; “<sup>l</sup>not

<sup>h</sup> Quod autem credimus posterioribus, circa quos non apparent virtutes divinæ, hoc est, quia non prædicant alia, quam quæ illi in scriptis certissimis reliquerunt. Quæ constat per medios in nullo fuisse vitiata ex consensione concordi in eis omnium succedentium usque ad tempora nostra. Hen. a Gand. Sum. p. i. A. 9. q. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Scripturas habemus ex traditione. S. Cyril. Hier. Catech. 4.—Multa quæ

non inveniuntur in literis apostolorum, &c. non nisi ab illis tradita et commendata creduntur. S. August. 2. de Baptism. contra Donat. c. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Non aliunde scientia cælestium. S. Hilar. lib. iv. de Trinit.—Si angelus de celo annuntiaverit præterquam quod in scripturis, &c. S. August. lib. iii. cont. Petil. c. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Quum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibi que ad omnia satis superque

but that the scripture is abundantly sufficient in and to itself for all things; but because it is deep, and may be drawn into different senses, and so mistaken, if any man will presume upon his own strength, and go single without the church." Sect. 16.

XXXIV.—To gather up whatsoever may seem scattered in this long discourse to prove that scripture is the word of God, I shall now in the last place put all together, that so the whole state of the question may the better appear.

First, then, I shall desire the reader to consider that every rational science requires some principles quite without its own limits, which are not proved in that science, but presupposed. Thus rhetoric presupposes grammar, and music arithmetic. Therefore it is most reasonable that <sup>m</sup>theology should be allowed to have some principles also, which she proves not, but presupposes. And the chiefest of these is, That the scriptures are of divine authority. Punct. 1.

Secondly, That there is a great deal of difference in the manner of confirming the principles of divinity, and those of any other art or science whatsoever. For the principles of all other sciences do finally resolve, either into the conclusions of some higher science, or into those principles which are *per se nota*, known by their own light, and are the grounds and principles of all science. And this is it which properly makes them sciences, because they proceed with such strength of demonstration as forces reason to yield unto them. But the principles of divinity resolve not into the grounds of natural reason, (for then there will be no room for faith, but all would be either knowledge or vision,) but into the maxims of divine knowledge supernatural. And of this we have just so much light and no more than God hath revealed unto us in the scripture. Punct. 2.

Thirdly, That though the evidence of these supernatural truths which divinity teaches appears not so manifest as Punct. 3.

sufficiat, &c. Vin. Iirin. contra Hæres. c. 2. And if it be *sibi ad omnia*, then to this to prove itself, at least after tradition hath prepared us to receive it.

<sup>m</sup> Omnis scientia præsupponit fidem aliquam. S. Prosper. in Psal. cxxiii. and St. Cyril, Hierosol. Catech. 5, shews

how all things in the world do *fide consistere*. Therefore most unreasonable to deny that to divinity which all sciences, nay all things challenge; namely, some things to be presupposed and believed.

Sect. 16.

that of the natural, <sup>n</sup>yet they are in themselves much more sure and infallible than they; for they proceed immediately from God, that heavenly wisdom, which being the fountain of ours must needs infinitely precede ours, both in nature and excellence. *He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?* <sup>o</sup>Psal. xciv. And therefore, though we reach not the order of their deductions, nor can in this life come to the vision of them, yet we yield as full and firm assent, not only to the articles, but to all the things rightly deduced from them, as we do to the most evident principles of natural reason. This assent is called *faith*; and faith being of *things not seen*<sup>p</sup>, Heb. xi., <sup>q</sup>would quite lose its honour, nay itself, if it met with sufficient grounds in natural reason whereon to stay itself. For faith is a mixed act of the will and the understanding, and the <sup>r</sup>will inclines the understanding to yield full approbation to that whereof it sees not full proof: not but that there is most full proof of them, but because the main grounds which prove them are concealed from our view, and folded up in the unrevealed counsel of God; God in Christ resolving to bring mankind to their last happiness by faith and not by knowledge, that so the weakest among men may have their way to blessedness open. And certain it is that many weak men believe themselves into heaven, and many over-knowing Christians lose their way

<sup>n</sup> Si vis credere manifestis invisibilibus, magis quam visibilibus oportet credere. Licet dictum sit admirabile, verum est, &c. S. Chrysostom. Hom. 46. ad Pop. And there he proves it.—Alia scientiæ certitudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanæ, quæ decipi potest: hæc autem ex lumine divini scientiæ, quæ decipi non potest. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 5. C.

<sup>o</sup> Psal. xciv. 10. Our old English translation reads it, *shall not he punish?* that is, shall not he know when, and why, and how to punish?

<sup>p</sup> Heb. xi. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Si sit ratio convincens, et propter eam quis credat, alias non crediturus, tollitur meritum fidei. Biel. 3. D. 25. q. unic. fine.—Non est dicendus credere, cujus judicium subigitur, aut cogitur, &c. Stapl. Triplicat. contra Whitak. cap. 6. p. 64.

<sup>r</sup> Fides non fit in nobis nisi volentibus. Tolet. in S. Joh. xvi. Annot. 33.

Et qui voluerunt, crediderunt. S. August. Serm. 60. de Verb. Dom. c. 5.—Fides actus est, non solius intellectus, sed etiam voluntatis, quæ cogi non potest. Imo magis voluntatis quam intellectus, quatenus illa operationis principium est, et assensum (qui proprie actus fidei est) sola elicit. Nec ab intellectu voluntas, sed a voluntate intellectus in actu fidei determinatur. Stapl. Triplic. cont. Whitak. c. 6. p. 64.—Credere enim est actus intellectus determinati ad unum ex imperio voluntatis. Thom. 2. 2. q. 4. A. 1. C.—Non potest dari aliquis assensus fidei, quicumque ille sit, qui non dependet in suis causis mediate vel immediate ab actu voluntatis. Alm. in 3. Sent. D. 24. Conclus. 6. Dub. 4. And St. Augustine says, Fidei locum esse cor. Tract. 52. in S. Joh.; where the heart is put for the whole soul, which equally comprehends both the will and the understanding. And so doth Biel also, in Sent. D. 25. q. unic. Art. 1. F.



thither, while they will believe no more than they can clearly know. In which pride and vanity of theirs they are left, and have these things hid from them<sup>s</sup>. Sect. 16.

Fourthly, That the credit of the scripture, the book in which the principles of faith are written, (as of other writings also,) depends not upon the subservient inducing cause that leads us to the first knowledge of the Author, which leader here is the church, but upon the Author himself, and the opinion we have of his sufficiency, which here is the Holy Spirit of God, whose penmen the prophets and apostles were. And therefore the mysteries of divinity contained in this book—as the incarnation of our Saviour, the resurrection of the dead, and the like—cannot finally be resolved into the sole testimony of the church, who is but a subservient cause to lead to the knowledge of the Author, but into the wisdom and sufficiency of the Author, who being omnipotent and omniscient must needs be infallible. Punct. 4.

Fifthly, That the assurance we have of the penmen of the scriptures, the holy prophets and apostles, is as great as any can be had of any human authors of like antiquity. For it is morally as evident to any pagan, that St. Matthew and St. Paul writ the Gospel and Epistles which bear their names, as that Cicero or Seneca wrote theirs. But that the apostles were divinely inspired whilst they writ them, and that they are the very word of God expressed by them, this hath ever been a matter of faith in the church, and was so even while the apostles themselves lived, and was never a matter of evidence and knowledge, at least as knowledge is opposed to faith. Nor could it at any time then be more demonstratively proved than now. I say, not *scientificce*, not demonstratively. For were the apostles living, and should they tell us that they spake and writ the very oracles of God, yet this were but their own testimony of themselves, Punct. 5.

<sup>s</sup> Matt. xi. 25.

<sup>t</sup> The apostles indeed they knew, for they had clear revelation: they to whom they preached might believe, but they could not know without the like revelation. So St. John xix. 35: *He that saw knows that he says true, that you which saw not might believe.*—Deus in prophetis (et sic in apostolis) quos

immediate illuminabat, causabat evidentiā. Jac. Almāin. in 3. Sent. Dist. 24. q. unica. Conclus. 6.—But for the residue of men it is no more but as Thomas hath it, *Oportet quod credatur auctoritati eorum, quibus revelatio facta est.* Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad 8.



Sect. 16. and so not alone able to enforce belief on others. And for their miracles, though they were very great inducements of belief, yet were neither they evident and convincing proofs<sup>u</sup> alone and of themselves; both because there may be counterfeit miracles, and because true ones are neither <sup>v</sup>infallible nor inseparable marks of truth in doctrine: not infallible, for they may be marks of false doctrine in the highest degree<sup>x</sup>, Deut. xiii.; not proper and inseparable, for yall which wrote by inspiration did not confirm their doctrine by miracles: for we do not find that David or Solomon, with some other of the prophets, did any, neither were any wrought by St. John the Baptist, <sup>z</sup>St. John x. So as credible signs they were and are still of as much force to us as it is possible for things on the credit of relation to be; for the witnesses are many, and such as spent their lives in making good the truth which they saw: but that the workers of them were divinely and infallibly inspired in that which they preached and writ, was still to the <sup>a</sup>hearers a matter of faith, and

<sup>u</sup> Non est evidens vel ista esse vera miracula, vel ista fieri ad illam veritatem comprobendam. Jac. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. unica. Conclus. 6. Therefore the miracles which Christ and his apostles did were fully sufficient to beget faith to assent, but not evidence to convince.

<sup>v</sup> Cautos nos fecit sponsus, quia et miraculis decipi non debemus. S. August. in S. Joh. tom. xiii. And he that says we ought not to be deceived, acknowledges that we may be deceived, even by miracles. And arguments which can deceive are not sufficient to convince; though they be sometimes too full of efficacy to pervert. And so plainly Almain out of Ocham. Nunquam acquiritur evidētia per medium quod de se generat falsum assensum, sicut verum. Jac. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. unic. Conclus. 6. And therefore that learned Roman catholic, who tells us "the apostles' miracles made it evident that their doctrine was true and divine," went too far. *Credible* they made it, but not *evident*. And therefore he is after forced to confess, "that the soul sometimes assents not to the miracles but in great timidity;" which cannot stand with clear evidence. And after again, "That the soul may renounce the doctrine formerly confirmed by

miracles, unless some inward and supernatural light be given," &c. And neither can this possibly stand with evidence. And therefore Bellarmine goes no further than this: *Miracula esse sufficientia, et efficacia ad novam fidem persuadendam*, de Notis Eccles. lib. iv. c. 14. §. 1, to induce and persuade, but not to convince. And Thomas will not grant so much, for he says expressly: *Miraculum non est sufficiens causa inducens fidem. Quia vidētium unum et idem miraculum, quidam credunt, et quidam non.* Thom. 2. 2. q. 6. A. 1. C. And Ambros. Catherin. in Rom. x. 15. is downright at *Nulla fides est habenda signo. Examinanda sunt, &c.* Anastasius Nizenus Episcopus, apud Baron. ad an. 360. num. 21.—*Non sunt necessaria signa veræ fidei, &c.* Suarez. Defens. Fidei Cathol. lib. i. cap. 7. num. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Deut. xiii. 1, 2, 3. 2 Thess. ii. 9. Mark xiii. 22.

<sup>y</sup> *Operatio virtutum alteri datur*, 1 Cor. xii. 10. (to one and another, he saith, not to all).—*dæmonia fugare, mortuos suscitare, &c. dedit quibusdam discipulis suis, quibusdam non dedit; (that is, to do miracles.)* S. August. Serm. 22. de Verbis Apost. c. 5.

<sup>z</sup> John x. 41.

<sup>a</sup> Here it may be observed, how

no more evident by the light of human reason to men that lived in those days than to us now. For had that been demonstrated, or been clear (as prime principles are) in its own light, both they and we had apprehended all the mysteries of divinity by knowledge, not by faith. But this is most apparent was not. For had the prophets or apostles been ordered by God to make this demonstratively or intuitively, by discourse or vision, appear as clear to their auditors as to themselves it did, that whatsoever they taught was divine and infallible truth, all men which had the true use of reason must have been forced to yield to their doctrine; Isaiah could never have been at *Domine quis?* <sup>b</sup> *Lord, who hath believed our report?* Isaiah liii.; nor Jeremy at *Domine factus sum,* <sup>c</sup> *Lord, I am in derision daily,* Jer. xx. Nor could any of St. Paul's auditors have mocked at him (as some of them did), <sup>d</sup> Acts xvii., for preaching the resurrection, if they had had as full a view as St. Paul himself had in the assurance which God gave of it in and by the resurrection of Christ, verse 31. But the way of knowledge was not that which God thought fittest for man's salvation. For man having sinned by pride, God thought fittest to humble him at the very root of the tree of knowledge, and make him deny his understanding and submit to faith, or hazard his happiness. The credible object all the while, that is, the mysteries of religion and the scripture which contains them, is divine and infallible, and so are the penmen of them by revelation. But we and all our forefathers, the hearers and readers of them, have neither <sup>e</sup> knowledge nor vision of the

warily A. C. carries himself: for when he hath said, "That a clear revelation was made to the apostles," which is most true; and so the apostles knew that which they taught *simpliciter a priori*, most demonstratively from the prime Cause, God himself: then he adds, p. 51. "I say, *clare in attestante*:" that is, the revelation of this truth was clear in the apostles that witnessed it. But to make it knowledge in the auditors, the same or like revelation, and as clear, must be made to them. For they could have no other knowing assurance; credible they might, and had. So A. C. is wary there, but comes not home to the business, and

so might have held his peace: for the question is not, what clear evidence the apostles had, but what evidence they had which heard them.

<sup>b</sup> Isaiah liii. 1. <sup>c</sup> Jer. xx. 7.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xvii. 32. And had Zedekiah and the people seen it as clearly as Jeremy himself did, that the word he spake was God's word and infallible, Jerusalem, for aught we know, had not been laid desolate by the Chaldeans. But because they could not see this by the way of knowledge, and would not believe it by way of faith, they and that city perished together. Jer. xxxviii. 17.

<sup>e</sup> Nemo pius, nisi qui scripturæ credit.

Sect. 16. prime principles in or about them, but <sup>f</sup>faith only. And the revelation which was clear to them is not so to us, nor therefore the prime tradition itself delivered by them.

Punct. 6. Sixthly, That hence it may be gathered, that the assent which we yield to this main principle of divinity—that the scripture is the word of God—is grounded upon no compelling or demonstrative ratiocination, but relies upon the strength of faith more than any other principle whatsoever. <sup>g</sup>For all other necessary points of divinity may by undeniable discourse be inferred out of scripture itself once admitted; but this concerning the authority of scripture not possibly; but must either be proved by revelation, which is not now to be expected, or presupposed and granted as manifest in itself, like the principles of natural knowledge, which reason alone will never grant; or by tradition of the church, both prime and present, with all other rational helps preceding or accompanying the internal light in scripture itself; which though it give light enough for faith to believe, yet light enough it gives not to be a convincing reason and proof for knowledge. And this is it which makes the very entrance into divinity inaccessible to those men who, standing high in the opinion of their own wisdom, will believe nothing but that which is irrefragably proved from rational principles: for as Christ requires a <sup>h</sup>denial of a man's self, that he may be able to follow him, so as great a part as any of this denial of his *whole* self (for so it must be) is the denial of his understanding, and the composing of the unquiet search of this grand inquisitor into the secrets of him that made it, and the overruling the doubtfulness of it by the fervency of the <sup>i</sup>will.

<sup>f</sup> S. August. cont. Faust. lib. xxvi. c. 6. Now no man believes the scripture that doth not believe that it is the word of God. I say, which doth not *believe*, I do not say, which doth not *know*. Oportet quod credatur auctoritati eorum quibus revelatio facta est. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad secundum.—*Ὅτι δὲ ψυχὴν ἔχομεν*, &c. Quod vero animam habemus, unde manifestum? Si enim visibilibus credere velis, et de Deo, et de angelis, et de mente, et de anima dubitatis: et sic tibi omnia veritatis dogmata deperibunt. Et certe si manifestis credere velis, invisibilibus magis quam visibilibus credere oportet.

Licet enim admirabile sit dictum, verum tamen, et apud mentem habentes valde certum, vel in confesso. Ex Homil. 13. S. Chrysost. in S. Matt. tom. i. edit. Fronto. Paris. 1636.

<sup>g</sup> And this is the ground of that which I said before, sect. 15. num. 1, that the scripture only, and not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of our faith, namely, when the authority of scripture is first yielded unto.

<sup>h</sup> Luke ix. 23.

<sup>i</sup> Intellectus credentis determinatur per voluntatem, non per rationem. Thom. 2. 2. q. 2. A. 1. ad tertium. And what power the will hath in case

Seventhly, That the knowledge of the Supreme Cause of Sect. 16.  
all (which is God) is most remote, and the most difficult Punct. 7.  
thing reason can have to do with. The *quod sit*, that there  
is a God, <sup>l</sup>blear-eyed reason can see; but the <sup>k</sup>*quid sit*, what  
that God is, is infinitely beyond all the fathoms of reason.  
He is a light indeed, <sup>l</sup>but so as no man's reason can come at  
for the brightness. If any thing therefore be attainable in  
this kind, it must be by <sup>m</sup>revelation; and that must be from  
himself: for none can reveal but <sup>n</sup>he that comprehends, and  
<sup>o</sup>none doth or can comprehend God but himself: and when  
he doth reveal, yet he is no further discernible than <sup>p</sup>himself  
pleases. Now since <sup>q</sup>reason teaches that the soul of man is  
immortal, and <sup>r</sup>capable of felicity; and since that felicity con-

of men's believing or not believing, is manifest, Jer. xlv. ; but this is spoken of the will compared with the understanding only, leaving the operations of grace free over both.

<sup>j</sup> Communis enim sententia est patrum et theologorum aliorum, demonstrari posse naturali ratione Deum esse; sed a posteriori et per effectus. Sic Thom. p. 1. q. 2. A. 2. et Damasc. Orth. Fid. lib. i. c. 3. et Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. 1. But what may be demonstrated by natural reason, by natural light may the same be known. And so the apostle himself, Rom. i. 20. *Invisibilia Dei a creatura mundi per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur.* And so Calvin most clearly, Instit. lib. i. c. 5. §. 1, *Aperire oculos nequeunt, quin aspicere eum coguntur;* though Bellarmine would needs be girding at him, De Grat. lib. iv. et Lib. Arbit. cap. 2, *Videntur autem et ratio iis quæ apparent attestari: omnes enim homines de diis (ut ille loquitur) habent existimationem.* Arist. de Cælo, lib. i. t. 22.

<sup>k</sup> Damasc. Orth. Fid. lib. i. c. 4.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 16.—*Et ne vestigium sic accedendi relinquit, nisi augeas imaginatione cogitationis lucem solis innumerabiliter vel quid aliud, &c.* S. August. De Trin. lib. viii. c. 2.—*Solus modus accedendi preces sunt.* Boeth. de Consolat. Philos. lib. v. prosa 3.

<sup>m</sup> Præter scientias philosophicas necesse est, ut ponatur alia scientia divinitus revelata de iis quæ hominis captum excedunt. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 1.

<sup>n</sup> And therefore Biel is express, that God could not reveal any thing that is to come, nisi illud esset a Deo præscitum seu prævisum, (i. e. unless God did

fully comprehend that which he doth reveal.) Biel. in 3. Sent. D. 23. q. 2. A. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Nullus intellectus creatus videndo Deum potest cognoscere omnia quæ Deus facit, vel potest facere: hoc enim esset comprehendere ejus virtutem, &c. Thom. p. 1. q. 12. A. 8. C.

Ad argumentum, Quod Deus ut speculum est, et Quod omnia quæ fieri possunt in eo resplendent, respondet Thom., Quod non est necessarium, quod videns speculum, omnia in speculo videat, nisi speculum visu suo comprehendat. Thom. p. 1. q. 12. A. 8. ad 2. (Now no man can comprehend this glass, which is God himself.)

<sup>p</sup> Deus enim est speculum voluntarium revelans quæ et quot vult alieni beato: non est speculum naturaliter repræsentans omnia. Biel. Suppl. in 4. Sent. D. 49. q. 3. propos. 3.

<sup>q</sup> For if reason well put to its search did not find this out, how came Aristotle to affirm this by rational disquisition, *Δείκνεται δὲ τὸν νοῦν,* &c. Restat, ut mens sola extrinsecus accedat, eaque sola divina sit; nihil enim cum ejus actione communicat actio corporalis? Arist. de Gen. Anim. lib. ii. c. 3. This cannot be spoken of the soul, were it mortal: and therefore I must needs be of Paulus Benius his opinion, who says plainly, and proves it too, Turpiter affixam a quibusdam Aristoteli mortalitatis animæ opinionem. Benius in Timæum Platonis, Decad. 2æ. lib. iii.

<sup>r</sup> For if reason did not dictate this also, whence is it that Aristotle disputes of the way and means of attaining it, Moral. l. i. c. 9, and takes on him to prove that felicity is rather an honourable than a

Sect. 16. sists in the contemplation of the highest Cause, which again is God himself; and since Christ therein confirms that dictate, that man's eternal happiness is <sup>s</sup>to know God and him whom he hath sent; and since nothing can put us into the way of attaining to that contemplation but some revelation of himself, and of the way to himself; I say, since all this is so, it cannot reasonably be thought by any prudent man, that the all-wise God should create man with a desire of felicity, and then leave him utterly destitute of all instrumental helps to make the attainment possible: since <sup>t</sup>God and nature do nothing but for an end; and help there can be none sufficient but by revelation. And once grant me that revelation is necessary, and then I will appeal to reason itself, and that shall prove abundantly one of these two;—that either there was never any such revelation of this kind from the world's beginning to this day; and that will put the *frustra* upon God in point of man's felicity—or, that the scriptures which we now embrace as the word of God is that revelation; and that is it we Christians labour to make good against all atheism, profaneness, and infidelity.

Punct. 8. Last of all; To prove that the book of God which we honour as his word is this necessary revelation of God and his truth, which must and is alone able to lead us in the way to our eternal blessedness, (or else the world hath none,) comes in a cloud of witnesses; some for the infidel, and some for the believer, some for the weak in faith, and some for the strong, and some for all: for then first comes in the tradition of the church, the present church; so it is no heretical or schismatical belief: then the testimony of former ages; so it is no new belief: then the consent of times; so it is no divided or partial belief: then the harmony of the prophets, and them fulfilled; so it is not a <sup>u</sup>devised, but a forespoken belief: then the success of the doctrine contained

commendable thing? c. 12. And after all this he adds, *Deo beata tota vita est, hominibus autem eatenus quatenus similitudo quadam ejusmodi operationis ipsis inest.* Moral. lib. x. c. 8.

<sup>s</sup> John xvii. 3.—*Ultima beatitudo hominis consistit in quadam supernaturali visione Dei. Ad hanc autem visionem homo pertingere non potest, nisi per*

*modum addiscentis a Deo doctore: Omnis qui audit a Patre et didicit,* Joh. vi. 45. Thom. 2. 2. q. 2. A. 3. in C.

<sup>t</sup> Deus et natura nihil frustra faciunt. Arist. de Celo, lib. i. t. 32.—*Frustra autem est quod non potest habere suum usum.* Thom. *ibid.*

<sup>u</sup> 2 Pet. i. 16.



in this book; so it is not a belief stifled in the cradle, but it hath spread through the world in despite of what the world could do against it, and increased from weak and unlikely beginnings to incredible greatness: then the constancy of this truth; so it is no moon-belief, for in the midst of the world's changes it hath preserved its creed entire through many generations: then, that there is nothing carnal in the doctrine; so it is a chaste belief; and all along it hath gained, kept, and exercised more power upon the minds of men, both learned and unlearned, in the increase of virtue and repression of vice, than any moral philosophy or legal policy that ever was: then comes the inward light and excellency of the text itself; and so it is no dark or dazzling belief. And it is an excellent text: for see the riches of natural knowledge which are stored up there, as well as supernatural: consider how things quite above reason consent with things reasonable: weigh it well, what majesty lies there hid under humility! what depth there is, with a perspicuity unimitable! what <sup>x</sup>delight it works in the soul that is devoutly exercised in it! how the <sup>y</sup>sublimest wits find in it enough to amaze them, while the <sup>z</sup>simplest want not enough to direct them! and then we shall not wonder if (with the assistance of <sup>a</sup>God's Spirit, who alone works faith and belief of the scriptures and their divine authority, as well as other articles) we grow up into a most infallible assurance, such an assurance as hath made many lay down their lives for this truth; such as that, <sup>b</sup>*though an angel from heaven should preach unto us another gospel*, we would not believe him or it; no, though we should see as great and as many miracles done over again to dissuade us from it as were at first to win the world to it. To which firmness of assent, by the operation

<sup>x</sup> Quasi quidam fluvius est, planus, et altus, in quo et agnus ambulet, et elephas natet. S. Greg. Præfat. in Lib. Moralium, c. 4.

<sup>y</sup> *In lege Domini voluntas ejus.* Psal. i. 2.—*Dulcior super mel et favum.* Psal. xviii. 11. et passim.

<sup>z</sup> Multa dicuntur submissis et humi repentibus animis, ut accommodatius per humana in divina consurgant. Multa etiam figurate, ut studiosa mens, et quæsitus exercentur utilius et uberius lætetur inventis. S. August. de Mor.

Eecl. Cath. c. 17.—Sed nihil sub spirituali sensu continetur fidei necessarium, quod scriptura per literalem sensum alicubi manifeste non tradat. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 10. ad 1.

<sup>a</sup> Credimus, &c. sicut ob alia multa certiora argumenta (quam est testimonium ecclesiæ) tum propter hoc potissimum, quod Spiritus Sanctus nobis intus has esse Dei voces persuadeat. Whitak. Disput. de Sacr. Script. Controv. 1. q. 3. c. 8.

<sup>b</sup> Gal. i. 8.



Sect. 16. of God's Spirit, the will confers as much or more strength than the understanding clearness; the whole assent being an act of faith, and not of knowledge. And therefore the question should not have been asked of me by *JF.*, how I *knew*, but upon what motives I did *believe* scripture to be the word of God? And I would have him take heed lest, hunting too close after a way of knowledge, he lose the way of faith, and teach other men to lose it too.

Punct. 9. So then the way lies thus (as far as it appears to me); The credit of scripture to be divine resolves finally into that faith which we have touching God himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this hath three main grounds, to which all other are reducible. The first is, the tradition of the church; and this leads us to a reverend persuasion of it. The second is, the light of nature; and this shews us how necessary such a revealed learning is, and that no other way it can be had; <sup>c</sup> may more, that all proofs brought against any point of faith neither are nor can be demonstrations, but soluble arguments. The third is, the light of the text itself, in conversing wherewith we meet with the <sup>d</sup>Spirit of God inwardly inclining our hearts, and sealing the full assurance of the sufficiency of all three unto us. And then, and not before, we are certain that the scripture is the word of God, both by divine and by infallible proof: but our certainty is by faith, and so voluntary, not by knowledge of such principles as in the light of nature can enforce assent whether we will or no.

I have said thus much upon this great occasion, because this argument is so much pressed without due respect to scripture. And I have proceeded in a synthetical way to build up the truth for the benefit of the church and the satisfaction of all men Christianly disposed: whereas, had I desired only to rid my hand of these captious Jesuits, (for certainly this question was captiously asked,) it had been sufficient to have restored the question thus; How do you know the testimony of the church (by which you say you

<sup>c</sup> Cum fides infallibili veritati innitatur; et ideo cum impossibile sit de vero demonstrari contrarium; sequitur omnes probationes quæ contra fidem inducuntur, non posse esse demonstrationes,

sed solubilia argumenta. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. C.

<sup>d</sup> Fidei ultima resolutio est in Deum illuminantem. S. August. cont. Fund. c. 14.

know scripture to be the word of God) to be divine and Sect. 16, 17.  
 infallible? If they prove it by scripture (as all of them do,  
 and as A. C. doth), how do they know that scripture to be A. C. p. 53.  
 scripture? It is but a circular assurance of theirs, by which Et vid. §. 16.  
 they found the church's infallibility upon the testimony of the num. 28.  
 scripture, and the scripture's infallibility upon the testimony  
 of the church; that is, upon the matter, the church's infalli-  
 bility upon the church's infallibility. But I labour for edifi-  
 cation, not for destruction. And now, by what I have here  
 said, I will weigh my answer, and his exception taken  
 against it.

¶. The bishop said that the books of scripture are prin-  
 ciples to be supposed, and needed not to be proved.

¶. Why, but did I say that this principle—the books of Sect. 17.  
 scripture are the word of God—is to be supposed, as needing  
 no proof at all to a natural man, or to a man newly entering  
 upon the faith? yea, or perhaps to a doubter or weakling in  
 the faith? Can you think me so weak? It seems you do.  
 But sure I know there is a great deal of difference between  
 ethnics, that deny and deride the scripture, and men that  
 are born in the church: the first have a further way about  
 to this principle; the other in their very Christian education  
 suck it in, and are taught, so soon as they are apt to learn  
 it, that the books commonly called “the Bible,” or “scrip-  
 ture,” are the word of God. And I dealt with you <sup>e</sup>as with  
 a Christian, though in error, while you call catholic. The  
 words before spoken by me were, “That the scripture only,  
 not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of faith.”  
 The question between us and you is, Whether the scripture  
 do contain all necessary things of faith. Now in this ques-  
 tion, as in all nature and art, the subject, the scripture, is  
 and must be <sup>f</sup>supposed. The *quære* between the Roman  
 catholics and the church of England being only of the predi-  
 cate, the thing uttered of it, namely, whether it contain all  
 fundamentals of faith, all necessaries for salvation within it.

<sup>e</sup> Dixi sicut ei congruebat ad quem  
 scribebam. S. August. Retract. lib. i.  
 c. 13.

<sup>f</sup> Nor is it such a strange thing to  
 hear that scripture is such a supposed

principle among Christians: Quod a  
 scriptura evidenter deducitur est evi-  
 denter verum, suppositis scripturis. Bel-  
 larm. de Eccl. Milit. lib. iv. c. 3. §. 3.

Sect. 17, 18. Now since the question proposed in very form of art proves not but <sup>g</sup>supposes the subject, I think I gave a satisfying answer—that to you and me, and in this question, scripture was a supposed principle and needed no proof. And I must tell you, that in this question of the scripture's perfect continent, it is against all art, yea, and equity too, in reasoning, to call for a proof of that here which must go unavoidably supposed in this question; and if any man will be so familiar with impiety to question it, it must be tried in a preceding question and dispute by itself: yet here not you only, but <sup>h</sup>Bellarmino and others, run quite out of the way to snatch at advantage.

<sup>f</sup>. Against this I read what I had formerly written in my reply against Mr. John White; wherein I plainly shewed that this answer was not good, and that no other answer could be made, but by admitting some word of God unwritten to assure us of this point.

Sect. 18. <sup>B</sup>. I.—Indeed, here you read out of a book (which you called your own) a large discourse upon this argument. But surely I so untied the knot of the argument, that I set you to your book again; for yourself confess that against this you read what you had formerly written. Well, whatever you read there, certain it is you do a great deal of wrong to <sup>i</sup>Mr. Hooker and myself, that because we call it a supposed or presumed principle among Christians, you should fall by and by into such a <sup>k</sup>metaphysical discourse, to prove that that which is a <sup>l</sup>*præcognitum*, foreknown in science, must be of such light that it must be known of and by itself alone,

<sup>g</sup> De subjecto enim quæritur semper, non subjectum ipsum.

<sup>h</sup> De Verb. Dei, lib. iv. c. 4. §. Quarto necesse est. And the Jesuit here apud A. C. p. 49.

<sup>i</sup> Eccles. Pol. b. iii. §. 8.

<sup>k</sup> Whereas Bellarmine says expressly that in the controversies between you and us, non agitur de metaphysicis subtilitatibus, quæ sine periculo ignorari, et interdum cum laude oppugnari possunt, &c. Præfat. Operibus præfix. §. 3.

<sup>l</sup> His omnibus quæstionibus præmittenda est controversia de verbo Dei.

Neque enim disputari potest, nisi prius in aliquo communi principio cum adversariis convenianus. Convenit autem inter nos et omnes omnino hæreticos, verbum Dei esse regulam fidei, ex qua de dogmatibus judicandum sit, esse commune principium ab omnibus concessum, unde argumenta ducantur, &c. Bellarm. Præfat. Operibus præfix. §. ult. And if it be "commune principium ab omnibus concessum," then I hope it must be taken as a thing supposed, or as a *præcognitum* in this dispute between us.

and that the scripture cannot be so known to be the word Sect. 18.  
of God.

II.—I will not now enter again into that discourse, having said enough already, how far the beam, which is very glorious (especially in some parts of scripture), gives light to prove itself. You see, neither Hooker, nor I, nor the church of England (for aught I know), leave the scripture alone to manifest itself by the light which it hath in itself: no; but when the present church hath prepared and led the way, like a preparing morning light, to sunshine, then indeed we settle for our direction, yet not upon the first opening of the morning light, but upon the sun itself. Nor will I make needless inquiry how far and in what manner a *præcognitum*, or supposed principle in any science, may be proved in a higher, to which that is subordinate, or accepted for a prime; nor how it may in divinity, where *præ* as well as *postcognita*, things fore as well as after-known, are matters, and under the manner of faith, and not of science strictly; nor whether a *præcognitum*, a presupposed principle in faith, which rests upon divine authority, must needs have as much and equal light to natural reason, as prime principles have in nature, while they rest upon reason; nor whether it may justly be denied to have sufficient light, because not equal. Your own school<sup>m</sup> grants, “That in us, which are the subjects both of faith and knowledge, and in regard of the evidence given in unto us, there is less light, less evidence in the principles of faith, than in the principles of knowledge, upon which there can be no doubt.” But I think the school will never grant that the principles of faith (even this in question) have not sufficient evidence. And you ought not to do as you did, without any distinction or any limitation, deny a *præcognitum*, or prime principle in the faith, because it answers not in all things to the prime principles in science in their light and evidence; a thing in itself directly against reason.

III.—Well, though I do none of this, yet first I must tell you that A. C. here steps in again, and tells me, “That though a *præcognitum* in faith need not be so clearly known

<sup>m</sup> Colligitur aperte ex Thom. p. 1. absolute. Bellarm. de Eccles. Mil. lib. iv.  
q. 1. A. §. ad 1.—Et articulorum fidei c. 3. §. 3.  
veritas non potest nobis esse evidens

Sect. 18. as a *præcognitum* in science, yet there must be this proportion between them, that whether it be in science or in faith, the *præcognitum*, or thing supposed as known, must be *prius cognitum*, first known, and not need another thing pertaining to that faith or knowledge to be known before it. But the scripture," saith he, "needs tradition to go before it, and introduce the knowledge of it: therefore the scripture is not to be supposed as a *præcognitum*, and a thing foreknown." Truly I am sorry to see in a man very learned such wilful mistakes. For A. C. cannot but perceive, by that which I have clearly laid down <sup>u</sup>before, that I intended not to speak precisely of a *præcognitum* in this argument: but when I said scriptures were principles to be supposed, I did not, I could not intend they were *prius cognita*, known before tradition, since I confess everywhere that tradition introduces the knowledge of them. But my meaning is plain—that the scriptures are and must be principles supposed, before you can dispute this question, <sup>o</sup>Whether the scriptures contain in them all things necessary to salvation. Before which question it must necessarily be supposed and granted on both sides that the scriptures are the word of God; for if they be not, it is instantly out of all question that they cannot include all necessaries to salvation. So it is a *præcognitum*, not to tradition, (as A. C. would cunningly put upon the cause,) but to the whole question of the scriptures' sufficiency. And yet if he could tie me to a *præcognitum* in this very question, and provable in a superior science, I think I shall go very near to prove it in the next paragraph, and entreat A. C. to confess it too.

IV.—And now having told A. C. this, I must secondly follow him a little further: for I would fain make it appear, as plainly as in such a difficulty it can be made, what wrong he doth truth and himself in this case. And it is the com-

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 17 and 18. num. II.

<sup>o</sup> And my immediate words in the conference, upon which the Jesuit asked how I knew scripture to be scripture, were, (as the Jesuit himself relates it, apud A. C. p. 48,) "That the scripture only, not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of our faith." Now the scripture cannot be the only foundation

of faith, if it contain not all things necessary to salvation; which the church of Rome denying against all antiquity, makes it now become a question. And in regard of this my answer was, "That the scriptures are and must be principles supposed, and *præcognita*, before the handling of this question."



mon fault of them all: for when the protestants answer to Sect. 18. this argument, (which, as I have shewed, can properly have no place in the question between us about tradition,) they which grant this as a *præcognitum*, a thing foreknown, as also I do, were neither ignorant nor forgetful, that things pre-supposed, as already known in a science, are of two sorts; “for either they are plain and fully manifest in their own light, or they are proved and granted already, some former knowledge having made them evident.” This principle then—the scriptures are the oracles of God—we cannot say is clear and fully manifest to all men simply and in self-light, for the reasons before given: yet we say, after tradition hath been our introduction, the soul that hath but ordinary grace added to reason may discern light sufficient to resolve our faith that the sun is there. This principle then, being not absolutely and simply evident in itself, is presumed to be taught us otherwise; and if otherwise, then it must be taught in and by some superior science to which theology is subordinate. Now men may be apt to think, out of reverence, that divinity can have no science above it; but your own school teaches me that it hath: “¶The sacred doctrine of divinity in this sort is a science, because it proceeds out of principles that are known by the light of a superior knowledge, which is the

p Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. iii. §. 8.

¶ Hoc modo sacra doctrina est scientia; quia procedit ex principiis notis lumine superioris scientiæ, quæ scilicet est scientia Dei et beatorum. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 2.—And what says A. C. now to this of Aquinas? Is it not clear in him that this principle—the scriptures are the word of God, of divine and most infallible credit—is a *præcognitum* in the knowledge of divinity, and provable in a superior science, namely, the knowledge of God and the blessed in heaven? Yes, so clear that (as I told you he would) A. C. confesses it, p. 51: but he adds, “That because no man ordinarily sees this proof, therefore we must go either to Christ, who saw it clearly, or to the apostles, to whom it was clearly revealed, or to them who by succession received it from the prime seers.” So now, because Christ is ascended, and the apostles gone into the number of the blessed, and made in a higher degree partakers

of their knowledge, therefore we must now only go unto their successors, and borrow light from the tradition of the present church: for that we must do, and it is so far well. But that we must rely upon this tradition as divine and infallible, and able to breed in us divine and infallible faith, as A. C. adds, p. 51, 52, is a proposition which in the times of the primitive church would have been accounted very dangerous, as indeed it is. For I would fain know why leaning too much upon tradition may not mislead Christians as well as it did the Jews. But they, saith St. Hilary, *traditionis favore legis præcepta transgressi sunt.* Can. 14. in S. Matt. Yet to this height are they of Rome now grown, that the traditions of the present church are infallible, and by outfacing the truth lead many after them; and as it is Jer. v. 31, *The prophets prophesy untruths, and the priests receive gifts; and my people delight therein: what will become of this in the end?*



Sect. 18. knowledge of God and the blessed in heaven." In this superior science, this principle—the scriptures are the oracles of God—is more than evident in full light. This superior science delivered this principle in full revealed light to the prophets and apostles: 'this infallible light of this principle made their authority derivatively divine. By the same divine authority they wrote and delivered the scripture to the church: therefore from them immediately the church received the scripture, and that uncorrupt, though not in the same clearness of light which they had. And yet since no sufficient reason hath or can be given that in any substantial thing it hath been <sup>s</sup> corrupted, it remains firm at this day, and that proved in the most supreme science; and therefore now to be supposed (at least by all Christians), that the scripture is the word of God. So my answer is good, even in strictness, That this principle is to be supposed in this dispute.

V.—Besides, the Jews never had nor can have any other proof that the Old Testament is the word of God than we have of the New; for theirs was delivered by Moses and the prophets, and ours was delivered by the apostles, which were prophets too. The Jews did believe their scripture by a divine authority: for so the Jews argue themselves; <sup>t</sup>*We know that God spake with Moses*; <sup>u</sup>and that "therefore they could no more err in following Moses than they could in following God himself." And our Saviour seems to infer as much St. John v., where he expostulates with the Jews thus: <sup>x</sup>*If you believe not Moses his writings, how should you believe me?* Now how did the Jews know that God spake to Moses? How! Why apparently the same way that is before set down. First, by tradition. So <sup>y</sup>St. Chrysostom: "We know why: By whose witness do you know? By the testimony of our

r Non creditur Deus esse author huius scientiæ, quia homines hoc testati sunt in quantum homines nudo testimonio humano; sed in quantum circa eos effulsit virtus divina. Et ita Deus iis, et sibi ipsi in eis testimonium perhibuit. Hen. a Gand. Sum. p. 1. q. 3. A. 9.

s Corrupti non possunt, quia in manibus sunt omnium Christianorum; et quisquis hoc primitus ausus esset, multorum codicum vetustiorum collatione confutaretur. Maxime, quia non una

lingua, sed multis continetur scriptura. Nonnullæ autem codicum mendositates, vel de antiquioribus, vel de lingua præcedente emendantur. S. August. cont. Faust. lib. xxxii. c. 16.

t John ix. 29.

u Itaque non magis errare posse eum sequentes, quam si Deum ipsum sequerentur. Maldon. in S. Joh. ix.

x John v. 47.

y Hom. 57. in S. Joh. 9. ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν τίνος εἰπόντος; τῶν προγόνων φασὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων.

ancestors." But he speaks not of their immediate ancestors, Sect. 18, 19. but their prime, which were prophets, and whose testimony was divine; into which (namely, their writings) the Jews did resolve their faith. And even that scripture of the Old Testament was a <sup>z</sup> light, and a shining light too; and therefore could not but be sufficient when tradition had gone before. And yet though the Jews entered this way to their belief of the scripture, they do not say <sup>a</sup> *Audivimus*, We have heard that God spake to Moses, but, We know it. So they resolved their faith higher, and into a more inward principle, than an ear to their immediate ancestors and their tradition. And I would willingly learn of you, if you can shew it me, where ever any one Jew, disputing with another about their law, did put the other to prove that the Old Testament was the word of God. But they still supposed it; and when others put them to their proof, this way they went. And yet you say,

℞. That no other answer could be made but by admitting some word of God unwritten to assure us of this point.

℞. I.—I think I have shewed that my answer is good, and Sect. 19. that no other answer need be made. If there were need, I make no question but another answer might be made to assure us of this point, though we did not admit of any word of God unwritten; I say, to assure us, and you express no more. If you had said, to assure us by divine faith, your argument had been the stronger: but if you speak of assurance only in the general, I must then tell you (and it is the great advantage which the church of Christ hath against infidels) a man may be assured, nay, infallibly assured, by ecclesiastical and human proof. Men that never saw Rome may be sure and infallibly believe that such a city there is, by historical and acquired faith: and if consent of human story can assure me this, why should not consent of church story assure me the other—that Christ and his apostles delivered this body of scripture as the oracles of God? For Jews, enemies to Christ, they bear witness to the Old Testament;

<sup>z</sup> 2 Pet. i. 19.

<sup>a</sup> S. Chrysost. ubi supra: καὶ οὐκ εἶπαν, ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, &c. ἀλλὰ ὅτι οἶδαμεν.

Sect. 19. and Christians through almost all nations <sup>b</sup>give in evidence to both Old and New: and no pagan, or other enemies of Christianity, can give such a worthy and consenting testimony for any authority upon which they rely, or almost for any principle which they have, as the scripture hath gained to itself: and as is the testimony which it receives above all <sup>c</sup>writings of all nations, so here is assurance in a great measure, without any divine authority in a word written or unwritten. A great assurance, and it is infallible too; only then we must distinguish infallibility. For, first, a thing may be presented as an infallible object of belief, when it is true, and remains so; for truth *qua talis*, as it is truth, cannot deceive. Secondly, a thing is said to be infallible, when it is not only true and remains so actually, but when it is of such invariable constancy, and upon such ground, as that no degree of falsehood at any time, in any respect, can fall upon it. Certain it is, that by human authority, consent, and proof, a man may be assured infallibly that the scripture is the word of God by an acquired habit of faith, *cui non subest falsum*, under which nor error nor falsehood is; but he cannot be assured infallibly by divine faith, <sup>d</sup>*cui subesse non potest falsum*, into which no falsehood can come, but by a divine testimony: this testimony is absolute in scripture itself, delivered by the apostles for the word of God, and so sealed to our souls by the operation of the Holy Ghost. That which makes way for this, as an <sup>e</sup>introduction and outward motive, is the tradition of the present church; but that neither simply divine, nor sufficient alone, into which we may resolve our faith, but only as is <sup>f</sup>before expressed.

II.—And now to come close to the particular. The time was, before this miserable rent in the church of Christ. (which I think no true Christian can look upon but with a bleeding heart,) that you and we were all of one belief: that belief

<sup>b</sup> Tanta hominum et temporum consensione firmatum. S. August. lib. de Mor. Eccles. Cath. c. 29.—Hi libri quoquo modo se habent, sancti tamen divinarum rerum pleni prope totius generis humani confessione diffamantur, &c. S. August. de Util. Cred. c. 7. et cont. Faust. lib. xiii. c. 15.

<sup>c</sup> Super omnes omnium gentium literas. S. August. de Civ. Dei, lib. xi. c. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Incertum esse non potest hos esse libros canonicos. Walden. Doct. Fid. l. ii. A. 2. c. 20.

<sup>e</sup> Facit ecclesiam causam sine qua non. Canus, Loc. l. ii. c. 8.

<sup>f</sup> Sect. 16.

was tainted, in tract and corruption of times, very deeply. Sect. 19.  
 A division was made, yet so that both parts held the Creed and other common principles of belief. Of these this was one of the greatest, <sup>g</sup>That the scripture is the word of God; for our belief of all things contained in it depends upon it. Since this division there hath been nothing done by us to discredit this principle: nay, we have given it all honour, and ascribed unto it more sufficiency, even to the “containing of all things necessary to salvation,” with <sup>h</sup>*satis superque*, enough and more than enough; which yourselves have not done, do not. And for begetting and settling a belief of this principle, we go the same way with you, and a better besides. The same way with you, because we allow the tradition of the present church to be the first inducing motive to embrace this principle; only we cannot go so far in this way as you, to make the present tradition always an infallible word of God unwritten; for this is to go so far in till you be out of the way. For tradition is but a lane in the church; it hath an end not only to receive us in, but another after to let us out into more open and richer ground. And we go a better way than you, because after we are moved, and prepared, and induced by tradition, we resolve our faith into that written word, and God delivering it; in which we find materially, though not in terms, the very tradition that led us thither. And so we are sure by divine authority that we are in the way, because at the end we find the way proved. And do what can be done, you can never settle the faith of man about this great principle till you rise to greater assurance than the present church alone can give. And therefore once again to that known place of St. Augustine: *the words of the Father are nisi commoveret*, “unless the authority of the church moved me:” but not alone, but with other motives; else it were not *commovere*, to move together: and the other motives are resolvers, though this be leader. Now since we go the same way with you so far as you go right, and a better way than you where you go wrong, we need not admit any other word

<sup>g</sup> Inter omnes pene constat, aut certe id quod satis est, inter me et illos, cum quibus nunc agitur, convenit hoc, &c. Sic in alia causa cont. Manichæos.

S. August. lib. de Mor. Eccles. Cath. c. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Vin. Lirin. cont. Hæres. c. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Contra Epist. Fund. c. 5.

Sect. 19, 20. of God than we do. And this ought to remain as a pre-supposed principle among all Christians, and not so much as come into this question about the sufficiency of scripture between you and us. But you say that

¶. From this the lady called us, and desiring to hear whether the bishop would grant the Roman church to be the right church, the ¶. granted that it was.

Sect. 20. ¶. I.—One occasion which moved Tertullian to write his book *de Præscript. adversus Hæreticos*, was, that he <sup>k</sup>saw little or no profit come by disputations. Sure the ground was the same then and now. It was not to deny that disputation is an opening of the understanding, a sifting out of truth: it was not to affirm that any such disquisition is in and of itself unprofitable; if it had, St. Stephen <sup>l</sup>would not have disputed with the Cyrenians, nor St. Paul <sup>m</sup>with the Grecians first, and then <sup>n</sup>with the Jews and all comers: no sure, it was some abuse in the disputants that frustrated the good of the disputation. And one abuse in the disputants is a resolution to hold their own, though it be by unworthy means, and <sup>o</sup>disparagement of truth. And so I find it here; for as it is true that this question was asked, so it is altogether false that it was asked in this <sup>p</sup>form, or so answered. There is a great deal of difference (especially as Romanists handle the question of the church) between *the* church and *a* church; and there is some between a *true* church and a *right* church, which is the word you use, but no man else that I know; I am sure not I.

II.—For *the church* may import in our language the *only true church*, and perhaps (as some of you seem to make it) the root and the ground of the catholic; and this I never did grant of the Roman church, nor ever mean to do. But *a church* can imply no more than that it is a member of the whole; and this I never did nor ever will deny, if it fall not absolutely away from Christ. That it is a *true* church I

<sup>k</sup> Pamel. in Summar. Lib. Videns disputationibus nihil aut parum profici.

<sup>l</sup> Acts vi. 9.

<sup>m</sup> Acts ix. 29.

<sup>n</sup> Acts xix. 17.

<sup>o</sup> Debilitatur generosa indoles conjecta in argutias. Sen. Ep. 48.

<sup>p</sup> Here A. C. hath nothing to say, but that "the Jesuit did not affirm that the lady asked this question in this or any other precise form." No! why, the words preceding are the Jesuit's own; therefore if these were not the lady's words, he wrongs her, not I him.



granted also, but not a *right* (as you impose upon me): for *ens* and *verum*, being and true, are convertible one with another; and every thing that hath a being is truly that being which it is, in truth of substance. But this word *right* is not so used, but is referred more properly to perfection in conditions; and in this sense every thing that hath a true and real being is not by and by right in the conditions of it. A man that is most dishonest and unworthy the name, a very thief (if you will), is a true man in the verity of his essence, as he is a creature endued with reason; for this none can steal from him, nor he from himself, but death; but is not therefore a right, or an upright man. And a church that is exceeding corrupt, both in manners and doctrine, and so a dishonour to the name, is yet a true church in the verity of essence, as a church is a company of men which profess the faith of Christ and are baptized into his name; but yet it is not therefore a right church, either in doctrine or manners. It may be you meant cunningly to slip in this word *right*, that I might, at unawares, grant it orthodox; but I was not so to be caught: for I know well that orthodox Christians are keepers of integrity and followers of right things, (so <sup>a</sup>St. Augustine,) of which the church of Rome at this day is neither. In this sense then no right, that is, no orthodox church at Rome.

III.—And yet no news it is that I granted the Roman church to be a true church; for so much very learned protestants have acknowledged before me, and the truth cannot deny it. For that church which receives the scripture as a rule of faith, though but as a partial and imperfect rule, and both the sacraments as instrumental causes and seals of grace, though they add more and misuse these, yet cannot but be a true church in essence. How it is in manners and doctrine, I would you would look to it with a single eye: <sup>s</sup>for

<sup>a</sup> Integritatis custodes, et recta sectantes. De vera Relig. c. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Hooker's Eccles. Pol. b. iii. §. 1. — Junius L. de Eccl. c. 17. Falluntur qui ecclesiam negant, quia papatus in ea est.—Reynold. Thes. 5. Negat tantum esse catholicam, vel samum ejus membrum.—Nay, the very separatists

grant it. Fr. Johnson, in his Treatise called A Christian Plea, printed 1617, p. 123, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Si tamen bono ingenio pietas et pax quedam mentis accedat, sine qua de sanctis rebus nihil prorsus intelligi potest. S. August. de Util. Cred. c. 18.



Sect. 20. if piety and a peaceable mind be not joined to a good understanding, nothing can be known in these great things."

A. C. p. 53. IV.—Here A. C. tells us, "That the Jesuit doth not say that the lady asked this question in this or any other precise form of words; but saith, the Jesuit is sure her desire was to know of me whether I would grant the Roman church to be the right church." And how was the Jesuit sure the

A. C. p. 54. lady desired to hear this from me? Why, A. C. tells us that too; for he adds, "That the Jesuit had particularly spoken with her before, and wished her to insist upon that point." Where you may see, and it is fit the clergy of England should consider with what cunning adversaries they have to deal, who can find a way to 'prepare their disciples, and instruct them beforehand upon what points to insist, that so they may with more ease slide that into their hearts and consciences which should never come there. And this once known I hope they will the better provide against it.

A. C. p. 54. But A. C. goes on and tells us, "That certainly, by my answer, the lady's desire must needs be to hear from me, not whether the church of Rome were a right church, &c., but whether I would grant that there is but one holy catholic church, and whether the Roman church (that is, not only that which is in the city or diocess of Rome, but all that agreed with it) be not it." About *a* church and *the* church I have said enough <sup>u</sup>before, and shall not repeat. Nor is there any need I should. For A. C. would have it the church, the one holy catholic church. But this cannot be granted, take the Roman church in what sense they please, in city or diocess, or all that agree with it. Yet howsoever, before I leave this, I must acquaint the reader with a perfect Jesuitism. In all the primitive times of the church, a man, or a family, or a national church, were accounted right and orthodox as they agreed with the catholic church; but the catholic was never then measured or judged by man, family, or nation. But now in the Jesuits' new school, the one holy

<sup>t</sup> And after A. C. saith again, p. 54, "That the lady did not ask the question as if she meant to be satisfied with hearing what I said." So belike they take caution beforehand for that

too, that whatever we say (unless we grant what they would have) their proselytes shall not be satisfied with it

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 20. num. I.

x catholic church must be measured by that which is in the city or diocese of Rome, or of them which agreed with it, and not Rome by the catholic. For so A. C. says expressly: "The lady would know of me, not whether that were the catholic church to which Rome agreed, but whether that were not the holy catholic church which agreed with Rome." So upon the matter, belike the Christian faith was committed to the custody of the Roman, not of the catholic church; and a man cannot agree with the catholic church of Christ (in this new doctrine of A. C.) unless he agree with the church of Rome: but if he agree with that, all is safe, and he is as orthodox as he need be.

V.—But A. C. is yet troubled about the form of the lady's question. And he will not have it "that she desired to know whether I would grant the Roman church to be the right church;" though these be her words according to the Jesuit's own setting down; but he thinks the question was, "Whether the church of Rome was not the right church:" A. C. p. 54. not "be not," but "was not." *Was not*, that is, "was not once, or in time past, the right church, before Luther and others made a breach from it." Why truly A. C. needed not have troubled himself half so much about this. For let him take his choice. It shall be all one to me, whether the question were asked by *be* or by *was*; for the church of Rome neither is nor was the right church, as the lady desired to hear. A particular church it is and was, and in some times right, and in some times wrong; and then in some things right, and in some things wrong: but the right church, or the holy catholic church, it never was, nor ever can be; and therefore was not such before Luther and others either left it or were thrust from it. A particular church it was: but then A. C. is not distinct enough here

x And though Stapleton, to magnify the church of Rome, is pleased to say, *Apud veteres pro eodem habita fuit ecclesia Romana et ecclesia catholica*; yet he is so modest as to give this reason of it; *Quia ejus communio erat evidenter et certissime cum tota catholica*. Relect. Cont. l. 9. 5. A. 3. (Lo, the communion of the Roman was then with the catholic church; not of the catholic with it!) And St. Cyprian

employed his legates, Caldonius and Fortunatus, not to bring the catholic church to the communion of Rome, but Rome to the catholic church: *Elaborarent, ut ad catholice ecclesie unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent, &c.* Now the members of this rent and torn body were they of Rome, then in an open schism between Cornelius and Novatian. S. Cyprian. lib. ii. epist. 10.

Sect. 20. neither; for the church of Rome both was and was not a right or orthodox church before Luther made a breach from it. For the word *ante*, before, may look upon Rome and that church a great way off, or long before; and then in the prime times of it it was a most right and orthodox church: but it may look also nearer home, and upon the immediate times before Luther, or some ages before that; and then in those times y Rome was a corrupt and a tainted church, far from being right; and yet both these times were before Luther made his breach. So here A. C. should have been more distinct. For the word *before* includes the whole time before Luther; in part of which time that church of Rome was right, and in other part whereof it was wrong. But z A. C. adds yet, “That I suspected the lady would infer, if once that church were right, what hindered it now to be, since that did not depart from the protestant church, but the protestant church from it?” Truly, I neither suspected the inference would be made, nor fear it when it is made; for it is no news that any particular church, Roman as well as another, may once have been right and afterwards wrong, and in far worse case: and so it was in Rome after the a *enemy had sowed tares among the wheat*. But whether these tares were sown while their bishops slept, or whether b they

y Cum infiniti abusus, schismata quoque et hæreses per totum nunc Christianum orbem invalescant, ecclesiam Dei legitima indigere reformatione nemini non apertum erit. Pet. de Aliaco Card. Cameracensis L. de Reform. Ecclesie. And if schisms and heresies did then invade the whole Christian world, let A. C. consider how Rome escaped free. And I think Cameracensis was in this prophetic; for sixty years and more before Luther was born, and so before the great troubles which have since fallen upon all Christendom, he used these words in the book which himself delivered up in the council of Constance: Nisi celeriter fiat reformatio, audeo dicere quod licet magna sint, quæ videmus, tamen in brevi incomparabiliter majora videbimus. Et post ista tonitrua tam horrenda, majora alia audiemus, &c. Camer. L. de Reform. Eccles. And it will hardly sink into any man’s judgment, that so great a man as Petrus de Aliaco was

in that church should speak thus, if he did not see some errors in the doctrine of that church as well as in manners. Nay, Cassander, though he lived and died in the communion of the church of Rome, yet found fault with some of her doctrines. Consult. Artic. 21 et 22. And Pope Julius III. professed at Bononia, In sacramentorum ecclesie ministerium innumerabiles abusus irrepisse. Espencaeus in Tit. 1. And yet he was one of the bishops, nay, the chief legate in the council of Trent.

z A. C. p. 54.

a Matth. xiii. 25.

b For A. C. knows well what strange doctrines are charged upon some popes: and all Bellarmine’s labour, though great and full of art, is not able to wash them clean. Bellarm. lib. iv. de Rom. Pont. c. 8, &c. Et papas quosdam graves errores seminasse in ecclesia Christi luce clarius est. Et probatur a Jacob. Almain. Opusc. de Author. Ecclesie, c. 10. And Cassander speaks

themselves did not help to sow them, is too large a disquisition for this place. So though it were once right, yet the tares which grow thick in it are the cause why it is not so now. And then, though that church did not depart from the protestants' church, yet if it gave great and just cause for the protestant church to depart from the errors of it, while it in some particulars departed from the truth of Christ, it comes all to one for this particular, That the Roman church, which was once right, is now become wrong, by embracing superstition and error.

¶ Further he confessed, "that protestants had made a rent and division from it."

¶ I.—I confess I could here be heartily angry, but that I have resolved in handling matters of religion to leave all gall out of my ink; for I never granted that the Roman church either is or was the right church. It is too true indeed that there is a miserable rent in the church, and I make no question but the best men do most bemoan it<sup>d</sup>; nor is he a Christian that would not have unity, might he have it with truth. But I never said nor thought that the protestants made this rent. The cause of the schism is yours; for you thrust us from you, because we called for truth and redress of abuses. For a schism must needs be theirs whose the cause of it is. The woe runs full out of the mouth of Christ ever against him that gives the offence, not against him that takes it ever. But you have by this

it out more plainly: Utinam illi (he speaks of the bishops and rectors in the Roman church) a quibus hæc informatio accipienda esset, non ipsi harum superstitionum auctores essent: vel certe eas in animis hominum simplicium aliquando questus causa nutrent. Casand. Consult. Art. 21. versus finem.

<sup>c</sup> Grave omnino crimen, sed defensionem longinquam non requirit, satis est enim negare; sicut pro ecclesia olim. S. August. de Util. Cred. c. 5.

<sup>d</sup> Hanc quæ respectu hominum ecclesia dicitur, observare, ejusque communionem colere debemus. Calv. Inst. 4. c. 1. §. 7.

<sup>e</sup> Recte scias nos fecisse recedendo a vobis, &c. Lucif. lib. de non conveniendo cum Hæreticis. He speaks of

the Arians, and I shall not compare you with them, nor give any offence that way. I shall only draw the general argument from it, thus: If the orthodox did well in departing from the Arians, then the schism was to be imputed to the Arians, although the orthodox did depart from them. Otherwise, if the orthodox had been guilty of the schism, he could not have said, *Recte scias nos fecisse recedendo*. For it cannot be that a man should do well in making a schism. There may be therefore a necessary separation, which yet incurs not the blame of schism; and that is, when doctrines are taught contrary to the catholic faith.

<sup>f</sup> Matth. xviii. 7.

Sect. 21. carriage given me just cause never to treat with you or your like but before a judge or a jury.

A. C. p. 55, 56. II.—But here A. C. tells me, “I had no cause to be angry, either with the Jesuit or myself. Not with the Jesuit, for he writ down my words in fresh memory, and upon special notice taken of the passage; and that I did say either *iisdem* or *equipollentibus verbis*, either in these or equivalent words, that the protestants did make the rent or division from the Roman church.” What! did the Jesuit set down my words in fresh memory, and upon special notice taken? and were they so few as these, “the protestants did make the schism,” and yet was his memory so short that he cannot tell whether I uttered this *iisdem* or *equipollentibus verbis*? Well, I would A. C. and his fellows would leave this art of theirs, and in conferences (which they are so ready to call for) impose no more upon other men than they utter. And you may observe too, that after all this full assertion that I spake this *iisdem* or *equipollentibus verbis*, A. C. concludes thus: “The Jesuit took special notice in fresh memory, and is sure he related, at least in sense, just as it was uttered.” What is this, “at least in sense, just as it was uttered?” Do not these two interfere, and shew the Jesuit to be upon his shuffling pace? For if it were just as it was uttered, then it was in the very form of words too, not in sense only; and if it were but at least in sense, then, when A. C. hath made the most of it, it was not just as it was uttered. Besides, “at least in sense” doth not tell us in whose sense it was: for if A. C. mean the Jesuit’s sense of it, he may make what sense he pleases of his own words; but he must impose no sense of his upon my words: but as he must leave my words to myself, so when my words are uttered or written, he must leave their sense either to me, or to that genuine construction which an ingenuous reader can make of them. And what my words of grant were I have before expressed, and their sense too.

A. C. p. 56. III.—Not with myself: that is the next. For A. C. says, “It is truth, and that the world knows it, that the protestants did depart from the church of Rome, and got the name of



protestants by protesting against it." No, A. C., by your leave, this is not truth neither; and therefore I had reason to be angry with myself had I granted it. For, first, the protestants did not depart: for departure is voluntary; so was not theirs. I say, not theirs, taking their whole body and cause together; for that some among them were peevish, and some ignorantly zealous, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confessing it. Your body is not so perfect (I wot well) but that many amongst you are as pettish and as ignorantly zealous as any of ours. You must not suffer for these, nor we for those, nor should the church of Christ for either. Next, the protestants did not get that name by protesting against the church of Rome, but by protesting (and that when nothing else would serve) <sup>h</sup>against her errors and superstitions. Do you but remove them from the church of Rome, and our protestation is ended, and the separation too. Nor is protestation itself such an unheard of thing in the very heart of religion; for the sacraments, both of the Old and New Testament, are called by your own school, visible signs protesting the faith. Now if the sacraments be *protestantia*, signs protesting, why may not men also, and without all offence, be called protestants; since, by receiving the true sacraments and by refusing them which are corrupted, they do but protest the sincerity of their faith against that doctrinal corruption which hath invaded the great sacrament of the Eucharist, and other parts of religion? especially since they are men <sup>i</sup>which must protest their faith by these visible signs and sacraments.

IV.—But A. C. goes on, and will needs have it, that the A. C. p. 56. protestants were the cause of the schism. "For," saith he, "though the church of Rome did thrust them from her by excommunication, yet they had first divided themselves by obstinate holding and teaching opinions contrary to the

<sup>h</sup> Conventus fuit ordinum imperii Spira. Ibi decretum factum est, ut edictum Wormatiense observaretur contra novatores (sic appellare placuit) et ut omnia in integrum restituantur, (et sic nulla omnino reformatio.) Contra hoc edictum solennis fuit protestatio, Aprilis 16. an. Christi 1529. Et hinc ortum pervulgatum illud protestantium

nomen. Vide Calvis. Chro. ab an. 1529. This protestation therefore was not simply against the Roman church, but against the edict, which was for the restoring of all things to their former estate without any reformation.

<sup>i</sup> Quibus homo fidem suam protestatur. Thom. p. 3. q. 61. A. 3. 4. C.



Sect. 21. Roman faith and practice of the church; which to do St. Bernard thinks is pride, and St. Augustine, madness." So then, in his opinion, first, excommunication on their part was not the prime cause of this division, but the holding and teaching of contrary opinions. Why, but then, in my opinion, that holding and teaching was not the prime cause neither; but the corruptions and superstitions of Rome, which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary. So the prime cause was theirs still. Secondly, A. C.'s words are very considerable; for he charges the protestants to be the authors of the schism for obstinate holding and teaching contrary opinions. To what, I pray? Why, to the <sup>k</sup>Roman faith. To the Roman faith! it was wont to be the Christian faith to which contrary opinions were so dangerous to the maintainers. But all is Roman now with A. C. and the Jesuit. And then, to countenance the business, St. Bernard and St. Augustine are brought in, whereas neither of them speak of the Roman; and St. Bernard, perhaps, neither of the catholic nor the Roman, but of a particular church or congregation; or if he speak of the catholic, of the Roman certainly he doth not. His words are, *Quæ major superbia*, &c.; "What greater pride than that one man should prefer his judgment before the whole congregation of all the Christian churches in the world?" So A. C. out of St. Bernard. <sup>l</sup>But St. Bernard not so. For these last words, "of all the Christian churches in the world," are not in St. Bernard. And whether *toti congregationi* imply more in that place than a particular church, is not very manifest; nay, I think it is plain that he speaks both of and to that particular congregation to which he was then preaching. And I believe A. C. will not easily find where *tota congregatio*, the whole congregation, is used in St. Bernard or any other of the Fathers

<sup>k</sup> I know Bellarmine quotes St. Jerome: *Scito Romanam fidem*, &c. supra §. 3. num. IX. But there St. Jerome doth not call it *fidem Romanam*, as if *fides Romana* and *fides catholica* were convertible; but he speaks of it in the concrete: *Romana fides*, i. e. Romanorum fides, *quæ laudata fuit ab apostolo*, &c., Rom. i. 8. S. Hieron. Apol. 3. cont. Rufin., that is, that faith which was then at Rome when St. Paul com-

mended it. But the apostle's commending of it in the Romans at one time passes no deed of assurance that it shall continue worthy of commendations among the Romans through all times.

<sup>l</sup> *Quæ major superbia, quam ut unus homo toti congregationi iudicium suum præferat, tanquam ipse solus Spiritum Dei habeat?* S. Bernard. Serm. 3. de Resur.

for the whole catholic church of Christ. And howsoever the Sect. 21.  
 meaning of St. Bernard be, it is one thing for a private man  
*judicium suum præferre*, to prefer and so follow his private  
 judgment before the whole congregation, which is indeed  
*lepra proprii consilii*, (as St. Bernard there calls it,) the proud  
 leprosy of the private spirit; and quite another thing for  
 an intelligent man, and in some things unsatisfied, modestly  
 to propose his doubts even to the catholic church. And  
 much more may a whole national church, nay, the whole body  
 of the protestants do it. And for St. Augustine, the place  
 alleged out of him is a known place. And he speaks indeed  
 of the whole catholic church. And he <sup>m</sup>says, (and he says  
 it truly,) “ It is a part of most insolent madness for any man  
 to dispute whether that be to be done, which is usually done  
 in and through the whole catholic church of Christ.” Where  
 first here is not a word of the Roman church, but of that  
 which is *tota per orbem*, all over the world, catholic, which  
 Rome never yet was. Secondly, A. C. applies this to the A. C. p. 56.  
 Roman faith, whereas St. Augustine speaks there expressly  
 of the rites and ceremonies of the church, and <sup>n</sup>particularly  
 about the manner of offering upon Maundy-Thursday, whether  
 it be in the morning, or after supper, or both. Thirdly, it is  
 manifest by the words themselves that St. Augustine speaks  
 of no matter of faith there, Roman nor catholic: for *fre-*  
*quentat* and *faciendum* are for things done and to be done,  
 not for things believed or to be believed. So here is not one  
 word for the Roman faith in either of these places; and  
 after this I hope you will the less wonder at A. C.’s boldness.  
 Lastly, a right sober man may, without the least touch of  
 insolency or madness, dispute a business of religion with the  
 Roman either church or prelate, (as all men know <sup>p</sup>Irenæus  
 did with Victor,) so it be with modesty, and for the finding  
 out or confirming of truth, free from vanity and purposed

<sup>m</sup> Similiter etiam siquid horum tota  
 per orbem frequentat ecclesia? Nam  
 et hinc quin ita faciendum sit disputare,  
 insolentissimæ insaniam est. S. August.  
 Epist. 118. c. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Quæris quid per quintam feriam  
 ultimæ hebdomadis quadragesimæ fieri  
 debet, an offerendum sit mane? &c.  
 S. August. Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> And so Bellarmine most expressly.  
 But then he adds, Universam ecclesiam  
 non posse errare, non solum in cre-  
 dendo, sed nec in operando; et præser-  
 tim in ritu, et cultu divino: lib. iv. de  
 Verb. Dei, c. 9. §. 4. And if this be  
 true, what is it to Rome?

<sup>p</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 26.  
 et Socrat. Hist. lib. v. c. 22.

Sect. 21. opposition against even a particular church. But in another way to dispute the whole catholic church, is just that which St. Augustine calls it, insolent madness.

V.—But now, were it so that the church of Rome were orthodox in all things, yet the faith, by the Jesuit's leave, is not simply to be called the Roman, but the Christian and the catholic faith. And yet A. C. will not understand this, but Roman and catholic, whether church or faith, must be one and the same with him; and therefore infers, "That there can be no just cause to make a schism or division from the whole church: for the whole church cannot universally err in doctrine of faith." That the whole church cannot universally err in the doctrine of faith is most true, and it is granted by divers <sup>9</sup>protestants; (so you will but understand its not erring in absolute fundamental doctrines;) and therefore it is true also that there can be no just cause to make a schism from the whole church: but here is the Jesuit's

<sup>9</sup> *Quaestio est, An ecclesia totalis totaliter considerata, i. e. pro omnibus simul electis, dum sunt membra militantis ecclesiae, possint errare, vel in tota fide, vel in gravi aliquo fidei puncto? Et respondimus simpliciter, id esse impossibile.* Keckerm. Syst. Theol. p. 387. edit. Hannoveriae, an. 1602.—Calvinus et ceteri haeretici concedunt ecclesiam absolute non posse deficere; sed dicunt intelligi debere de ecclesia invisibili. Bellarm. de Eccles. Milit. lib. iii. c. 13. §. 1. But this exception of Bellarmine's, that the protestants, whom out of his liberality he calls heretics, speak of the invisible church, is merely frivolous. For the church of the elect is in the church of them that are called, and the invisible church in the visible. Therefore if the whole church of the elect cannot err in fundamentals, the whole visible church in which the same elect are cannot err. Now that the invisible church of the elect is in the visible, is manifest out of St. Augustine; *Ipsa est ecclesia, quae intra sagenam dominicam cum malis piscibus natat.* S. August. Epist. 48.—*Grana sunt inter illam paleam, quando area cum videretur tota, palea putabatur.* S. August in Psal. cxxi. And this is proved at large by Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. iii. §. 1. For else the elect or invisible church is tied

to no duty of Christianity. For all such duties are required of the church as it is visible, and performed in the church as it is visible. As we hold it impossible that the church should ever by apostasy and misbelief wholly depart from God, &c., so we hold that it never falls into heresy. So that Bellarmine is as much to be blamed for idle and needless busying himself to prove, that the visible church never falls into heresy, which we most willingly grant, (Field. de Eccles. lib. iv. c. 2.) taking the church for all the believers now living, and in things necessary to be known expressly. *Ibid.* Calvinus dicit hanc propositionem—*Ecclesia non potest errare—veram esse, si intelligatur cum duplici restrictione.* Prima est, si non proponat dogmata extra scripturam, &c. (And indeed Calvin doth say so, *Instit. lib. iv. c. 8. §. 13.*) Secunda est, si intelligatur de sola ecclesia universalis, non autem de representativa. Bellarm. de Eccles. Milit. lib. iii. c. 14. §. 2. And I hope it is as good and a better restriction in Calvin, to say the catholic church cannot err if it keep to the scripture, than for Bellarmine to say the particular church of Rome cannot err because of the pope's residing there, or the pope cannot err if he keep his chair; which yet he affirms, de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 4. §. 2.

cunning; the whole church with him is the Roman, and those Sect. 21.  
 parts of Christendom which subject themselves to the Roman  
 bishop; all other parts of Christendom are in heresy and  
 schism, and what A. C. pleases. Nay, soft; for another  
 church may separate from Rome, if Rome will separate from  
 Christ; and so far as it separates from him and the faith,  
 so far may another church separate from it. And this is all  
 that the learned protestants do or can say, and I am sure all  
 that ever the church of England hath either said or done.  
 And that the whole church cannot err in doctrines absolutely  
 fundamental and necessary to all men's salvation (besides the  
 authority of these protestants, most of them being of prime  
 rank) seems to me to be clear by the promise of Christ, St.  
 Matth. xvi., *that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*;  
 whereas most certain it is that the gates of hell prevail very  
 far against it, if the whole militant church universally taken  
 can err from or in the foundation: but then this power of  
 not erring is not to be conceived as if it were in the church  
*primo et per se*, originally, or by any power it hath of itself:  
 for the church is constituted of men, and *humanum est errare*,  
 all men can err. But this power is in it partly by the virtue  
 of this promise of Christ, and partly by the matter which it  
 teacheth, which is the unerring word of God, so plainly and  
 manifestly delivered to her, as that it is not possible she  
 should universally fall from it or teach against it in things  
 absolutely necessary to salvation. Besides, it would be well  
 weighed, whether to believe or teach otherwise will not im-  
 peach the article of the Creed concerning the holy catholic  
 church, which we profess we believe; for the "holy catholic  
 church there spoken of contains not only the whole militant  
 church on earth, but the whole triumphant also in heaven;"  
 for so <sup>s</sup>St. Augustine hath long since taught me. Now if  
 the whole catholic church in this large extent be holy, then  
 certainly the whole militant church is holy as well as the  
 triumphant; though in a far lower degree, inasmuch as all  
<sup>t</sup>sanctification, all holiness, is imperfect in this life, as well in

<sup>r</sup> Matt. xvi. 18.

<sup>s</sup> Ecclesia hic tota accipienda est, non  
 solum ex parte qua peregrinatur in ter-  
 ris, &c. verum etiam ex illa parte quæ

in cælis, &c. S. August. Enchir. c. 56.

<sup>t</sup> Nemo ex toto sanctus. Optat. lib.  
 vii. contra Parmen.

Sect. 21. churches as in men. Holy then the whole militant church is. For that which the apostle speaks of Abraham is true of the church, which is a body collective, made up of the spiritual seed of Abraham: <sup>u</sup>*If the root be holy, so are the branches.* Well, then, the whole militant church is holy, and so we believe. Why, but will it not follow then, that the whole militant church cannot possibly err in the foundations of the faith? That she may err in superstructures and deductions, and other by and unnecessary truths, if her curiosity or other weakness carry her beyond or cause her to fall short of her rule, no doubt need be made; but if she can err either from the foundation or in it, she can be no longer holy, and that article of the Creed is gone. For if she can err quite from the foundation, then she is nor holy nor church, but becomes an infidel. Now this cannot be, for <sup>x</sup>all divines, ancient and modern, Romanists and reformers, agree in this, “That the whole militant church of Christ cannot fall away into general apostasy.” And if she err in the foundation, that is, in some one or more fundamental points of faith, then she may be a church of Christ still, but not holy, but becomes heretical: and most certain it is, that no <sup>y</sup>assembly (be it never so general) of such heretics is or can be holy. Other errors that are of a meaner allay take not holiness from the church, but these that are dyed in grain cannot consist with holiness; of which faith in Christ is the very foundation. And therefore, if we will keep up our Creed, the whole militant church must be still holy. For if it be not so still, then there may be a time that *falsum* may *subesse fidei catholicae*, that falsehood, and that in a high degree, in the very article, may be the subject of the catholic faith; which were no less than blasphemy to affirm: for we must still believe the holy catholic church. And if she be not still

<sup>u</sup> Rom. xi. 16.

<sup>x</sup> Dum Christus orat in excelso, navicula (id est, ecclesia) turbatur fluctibus in profundo, &c.; sed quia Christus orat, non potest mergi. S. August. Serm. 14. de Verb. Dom. c. 2. Et Bellarm. de Eccles. Milit. lib. iii. c. 13. — Præsidio Christi fulcitur ecclesiæ perpetuitas, ut inter turbulentas agitationes, et formidabiles motus, &c. salva tamen maneat. Calvin. Inst. lib. ii. c. 15.

§. 3.—Ipsa symboli dispositione admonetur perpetuam residere in ecclesia Christi remissionem peccatorum. Calv. Instit. lib. iv. c. 1. §. 17. Now remission of sins cannot be perpetual in the church, if the church itself be not perpetual: but the church itself cannot be perpetual if it fall away.

<sup>y</sup> Spiritus sanctificationis non potest inveniri in hæreticorum mentibus, S. Hieron. in Jerem. x.



holy, then at that time when she is not so we believe a false- hood under the article of the catholic faith. Therefore a very dangerous thing it is to cry out in general terms that the whole catholic militant church can err, and not limit nor distinguish in time that it can err indeed; for ignorance it hath, and ignorance can err; but err it cannot, either by falling totally from the foundation, or by heretical error in it: for the holiness of the church consists as much, if not more, in the verity of the faith, as in the integrity of manners taught and commanded in the doctrine of faith. Sect. 21.

VI.—Now in this discourse A. C. thinks he hath met with me; for he tells me, “That I may not only safely grant that protestants made the division that is now in the church, but further also, and that with a safe confidence, as one did—was it not you?” saith he—“that it was ill done of those who first made the separation.” Truly I do not now remember whether I said it or no; but because A. C. shall have full satisfaction from me, and without any tergiversation, if I did not say it then, I do say it now: and most true it is, that it was ill done of those, whoever they were, that first made the separation. But then A. C. must not understand me of *actual* only, but of *casual* separation: for (as I said <sup>z</sup>before) the schism is theirs whose the cause of it is; and he makes the separation that gives the first just cause of it, not he that makes an actual separation upon a just cause preceeding. And this is so evident a truth that A. C. cannot deny it, for he says it is most true: neither can he deny it in this sense in which I have expressed it; for his very assertion against us (though false) is in these terms, “that we gave the first cause;” therefore he must mean it of casual, not of actual separation only. A. C. p. 56.

VII.—But then A. C. goes on and tells us, “That after this breach was made, yet the church of Rome was so kind and careful to seek the protestants, that she invited them publicly with safe-conduct to Rome, to a general council, freely to speak what they could for themselves.” Indeed, I think the church of Rome did carefully seek the protestants. but I doubt it was to bring them within their net: and A. C. p. 57.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 21. num. I.



Sect. 21. she invited them to Rome; a very safe place, if you mark it, for them to come to; just as the lion (in the <sup>a</sup>apologue) invited the fox to his own den. Yea, but there was safe-conduct offered too. Yes, conduct perhaps, but not safe; or safe perhaps for going thither, but none for coming thence; *vestigia nulla retrorsum*. Yea, but it should have been to a general council. Perhaps so. But was the conduct safe that was given for coming to a council which they call general to some others before them? No sure, <sup>b</sup>John Huss and Jerome of Prague burnt for all their safe-conduct. And so long as the <sup>c</sup>Jesuits write and maintain that "faith given is not to be kept with heretics," and the church of Rome leaves this lewd doctrine uncensured, (as it hath hitherto done, and no ex-

<sup>a</sup> Olim quod vulpes aegroti cauta leoni  
Respondit, referam, Quia me vestigia  
terrent  
Omnia te adversum spectantia, nulla  
retrorsum.  
Hor. lib. i. ep. 1. ex Æsop.

<sup>b</sup> Though I cannot justify all which these two men said, yet safe-conduct being given, that public faith ought not to have been violated.

<sup>c</sup> Affirmant uno consensu omnes catholici, debere hæreticis servari fidem, sive salvus-conductus concedatur, jure communi sive speciali. Bec. Dis. Theol. de Fide Hæreticis servanda, c. 12. §. 5. But for all this brag of "Affirmant uno consensu omnes catholici," Becanus shuffles pitifully to defend the council of Constance: for thus he argues; Fides non est violata Husso. Non a patribus: illi enim fidem non dederunt. Non ab imperatore Sigismundo: ille enim dedit fidem, sed non violavit. Ibid. §. 7. But all men know that the emperor was used by the Fathers at Constance to bring Huss thither: Sigismundus Hussum Constantium vocat, et missis literis publica fide cavet, mense Octob. anno 1414. &c. edit. in 16.—Et etiamsi primo graviter tulit Hussi in carcerationem, tamen cum dicerent "Fidem hæreticis non esse servandam," non modo remisit offensionem, sed et prius acerbè in eum pronuciavit. Ibid. This is a mockery: and Becanus his argument is easily turned upon himself. For if the Fathers did it in cunning, that the emperor should give safe-conduct which themselves meant not to keep, then they broke faith: and if the emperor knew

they would not keep it, then he himself broke faith, in giving a safe conduct which he knew to be invalid. And as easy is it to answer what Becanus adds to save that council's act, could I stay upon it.

Fides hæreticis data servanda non est, sicut nec tyrannis, piratis et cæteris publicis prædonibus, &c. Simanca, Instit. Tit. 46. §. 51. And although Becanus in the place above cited, §. 13, confidently denies that the Fathers at Constance decreed "no faith to be kept with heretics," and cites the words of the council, Sess. 19, yet there the very words themselves have it thus: Posse concilium eos punire, &c. etiamsi de salvo-conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, &c. And much more plainly Simanca, Instit. 46. §. 52; Jure igitur hæretici quidam gravissimo concilii Constantiensis judicio legitima flamma concremati sunt, quanvis promissa illis securitas fuisset. So they are not only protestants which charge the council of Constance with this: nor can Becanus say as he doth, Affirmant uno consensu omnes catholici, fidem hæreticis servandam esse: for Simanca denies it; and he quotes others for it which A. C. would be loath should not be accounted catholics. But how faithfully Simanca says the one, or Becanus the other, let them take it between them, and the reader be judge. In the mean time the very title of the canon of the council of Constance, Sess. 19, is this: Quod non obstantibus salvis-conductibus imperatoris, regum, &c. possit per judicem competentem de hæretica pravitate inquiri.

ception put in of force and violence,) A. C. shall pardon us Sect. 21. that we come not to Rome, nor within the reach of Roman power, what freedom of speech soever be promised us. For to what end is freedom of speech on their part, <sup>d</sup>since they are resolved to alter nothing? and to what end freedom of speech on our part, if after speech hath been free, life shall not?

VIII.—And yet for all this A. C. “makes no doubt but A. C. p. 57. that the Roman church is so far from being cause of the continuance of the schism, or hinderance of the reunion, that it would yet give a free hearing with most ample safe-conduct, if any hope might be given that the protestants would sincerely seek nothing but truth and peace.” Truly A. C. is very resolute for the Roman church; yet how far he may undertake for it I cannot tell; but for my part, I am of the same opinion for the continuing of the schism that I was for the making of it; that is, that it is ill, very ill done of those, whoever they be, papists or protestants, that give just cause to continue a separation. But for free hearings or safe-conducts I have said enough, till that church do not only *say* but *do* otherwise. And as for truth and peace, they are in every man’s mouth with you and with us; but lay they but half so close to the hearts of men as they are common on their tongues, it would soon be better with Christendom than at this day it is, or is like to be. And for the protestants in general, I hope they seek both truth and peace sincerely: the church of England I am sure doth, and hath taught me to <sup>e</sup>pray for both, as I most heartily do; but what Rome doth in this, if the world will not see, I will not censure.

IX.—And for that which A. C. adds, “That such a free A. C. p. 57. hearing is more than ever the English catholics could obtain, though they have often offered and desired it, and that but under the prince’s word; and that no answer hath, nor no

<sup>d</sup> For so much A. C. confesses, p. 45. For if they should give way to the altering of one, then why not of another, and another, and so of all? And the Trent Fathers in a great point of doctrine being amazed, and not knowing what to answer to a bishop of their own, yet were resolved not to part with their common error. *Certum tamen*

*erat doctrinam eam non probare, sed quam antea didicissent firmiter tenere, &c.* Hist. Concil. Trid. lib. ii. p. 277. edit. Leyd. 1622.

<sup>e</sup> Beseeching God to inspire continually the universal church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord, &c. in the prayer for the militant church, and in the third collect on Good Friday.

Sect. 21, 22. good answer can be given." And he cites Campian for it. How far or how often this hath been asked by the English Romanists I cannot tell, nor what answer hath been given them; but surely Campian was too bold, and so is A. C. too, to say <sup>f</sup>*honestum responsum nullum*, no good answer can be given; for this, I think, is a very good answer—that the kings and the church of England had no reason to admit of a public dispute with the English Romish clergy, till they shall be able to shew it under the seal or powers of Rome, that that church will submit to a third, who may be an indifferent judge between us and them, or to such a general council as is <sup>g</sup>after mentioned. And this is an honest, and I think a full answer. And without this all disputation must end in clamour: and therefore the more public the worse; because as the clamour is the greater, so perhaps will be the schism too.

§. Moreover he said he would ingenuously acknowledge that the corruption of manners in the Romish church was not a sufficient cause to justify their departing from it.

Sect. 22. ¶. I would I could say you did as ingenuously repeat as I did confess; for I never said that corruption of manners was or was not a sufficient cause to justify their departure. How could I say this, since I did not grant that they did depart otherwise than is <sup>h</sup>before expressed? There is difference between departure and causeless thrusting from you; for out of the church is not in your power (God be thanked) to thrust us: think on that. And so much I said expressly then. That which I did ingenuously confess was this, "That corruption in manners only is no sufficient cause to make a separation in the church;" <sup>i</sup>nor is it: it is a truth agreed on by the Fathers, and received by divines of all sorts, save by the Cathari, to whom the Donatist and the Anabaptist after accorded, and against whom <sup>k</sup>Calvin disputes it strongly. And <sup>l</sup>St. Augustine is plain: "There are bad fish in the net

<sup>f</sup> Campian. Pref. Rationibus præfixa.  
<sup>g</sup> Sect. 26. num. 1.

<sup>h</sup> Sect. 21. num. VI.

<sup>i</sup> Modo ea quæ ad cathedram pertinent, recta præcipiant. S. Hier. Ep. 236.

<sup>k</sup> Instit. lib. iv. c. 1. §. 13, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Ep. 48. A malis piscibus corde semper et moribus separantur, &c.; corporalem separationem in litore maris, hoc est, in fine sæculi expectant.

of the Lord, from which there must be ever a separation in heart and in manners; but a corporal separation must be expected at the seashore, that is, the end of the world." And the best fish that are must not tear and break the net because the bad are with them. And this is as ingenuously confessed *for* you as *by* me: for if corruption in manners were a just cause of actual separation of one church from another in that catholic body of Christ, the church of Rome hath given as great cause as any; "since (as <sup>m</sup>Stapleton grants) there is scarce any sin that can be thought by man (heresy only excepted) with which that see hath not been foully stained, especially from eight hundred years after Christ." And he need not except heresy, into which <sup>n</sup>Biel grants it possible the bishops of that see may fall. And <sup>o</sup>Stella and Almain grant it freely that some of them did fall, and so ceased to be heads of the church, and left Christ (God be thanked) at that time of his vicars' defection to look to his cure himself.

¶. But, saith he, beside corruption of manners, there were also errors in doctrine.

§. This I spake indeed. And can you prove that I spake not true in this? But I added, (though here again you are pleased to omit it,) "That some of the errors of the Roman church were dangerous to salvation." For it is not every light error in disputable doctrine and points of curious speculation that can be a just cause of separation in that admirable body of Christ which is his church, or of one member of it from another: for he gave his natural body to be rent and torn upon the cross, that his mystical body might be one. And <sup>q</sup>St. Augustine infers upon it, "That he is no way partaker of divine charity that is an enemy to this unity." Now what errors in doctrine may give just cause of separation in this body, or the parts of it one from another, were it never

<sup>m</sup> Vix ullum peccatum (sola hæresi excepta) cogitari potest, quo illa sedes turpiter maculata non fuerit, maxime ab anno 800. Relect. Cont. 1. q. 5. Art. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Biel. in Can. Miss. Lect. 23.

<sup>o</sup> Stel. in S. Luc. c. 22. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. 1. fine. Multæ sunt

decretales hæreticæ, &c. And so they erred as popes.

<sup>p</sup> Eph. i. 23.

<sup>q</sup> S. August. Epist. 50.—Et iterum columbæ non sunt qui ecclesiam dissipant. Accipitres sunt, milvi sunt: non laniat columba, &c. S. August. Tract. 5. in S. Joh.

Sect. 23, 24. so easy to determine, (as I think it is most difficult,) I would not venture to set it down in particular, lest in these times of discord I might be thought to open a door for schism; which surely I will never do, unless it be to let it out. But that there are errors in doctrine, and some of them such as most manifestly endanger salvation, in the church of Rome, is evident to them that will not shut their eyes; the proof whereof runs through the particular points that are between

A. C. p. 55. us, and so is too long for this discourse. Now here A. C. would fain have a reason given him "why I did endeavour to shew what cause the protestants had to make that rent or division, if I did not grant that they made it?" Why truly in this reasonable demand I will satisfy him. I did it partly because I had granted it in the general, that corruption in manners was no sufficient cause of separation of one particular church from another, and therefore it lay upon me at least to name in general what was; and partly because he and his party will needs have it so that we did make the separation: and therefore, though I did not grant it, yet amiss I thought it could not be to declare, by way of supposition, that if the protestants did at first separate from the church

A. C. p. 56. of Rome, they had reason so to do; for A. C. himself confesses, "That error in doctrine of the faith is a just cause of separation, so just as that no cause is just but that." Now had I leisure to descend into particulars, or will to make the rent in the church wider, it is no hard matter to prove that the church of Rome hath erred in the doctrine of faith, and dangerously too: and I doubt I shall afterwards descend to particulars, A. C. his importunity forcing me to it.

¶ Which when the general church would not reform, it was lawful for particular churches to reform themselves.

Sect. 24. 33. I.—Is it then such a strange thing that a particular church may reform itself, if the general will not? I had thought, and do so still, that in point of reformation of either manners or doctrine, it is lawful for the church since Christ to do as the church before Christ did and might do. The church before Christ consisted of Jews and proselytes: this church came to have a separation upon a most ungodly policy



of <sup>r</sup>Jeroboam's, so that it never pieced together again. To a Sect. 24.  
 common council, to reform all, they would not come. Was  
 it not lawful for Judah to reform herself when Israel would  
 not join? Sure it was, or else the prophet deceives me, that  
 says expressly, <sup>s</sup>*Though Israel transgress, yet let not Judah sin.*  
 And St. Jerome <sup>t</sup>expounds it of this very particular sin of  
 heresy and error in religion. Nor can you say that <sup>u</sup>Israel  
 from the time of the separation was not a church; for there  
 were true prophets in it, <sup>x</sup>Elias, and <sup>y</sup>Elisæus, and others,  
 and <sup>z</sup>thousands that had not bowed knees to Baal: and there  
 was salvation for these, which cannot be in the ordinary way  
 where there is no church. And God threatens to <sup>a</sup>cast them  
 away to wander among the nations, and be no congregation,  
 no church: therefore he had not yet cast them away in *non*  
*ecclesiam*, into no church. And they are expressly called  
<sup>b</sup>*the people of the Lord* in Jehu's time, and so continued long  
 after. Nor can you plead that Judah is your part and the  
 ten tribes ours, (as some of you do;) for if that be true, you  
 must grant that the multitude and greater number is ours;  
 and where then is multitude, your numerous note of the  
 church? for the ten tribes were more than the two. But  
 you cannot plead it; for certainly, if any calves be set up,  
 they are in Dan and in Bethel, they are not ours.

II.—Besides, to reform what is amiss in doctrine or man-  
 ners is as lawful for a particular church as it is to publish  
 and promulgate any thing that is catholic in either; and  
 your question, *quo jure?* lies alike against both. And yet  
 I think it may be proved that the church of Rome, and that  
 as a particular church, did promulgate an orthodox truth  
 which was not then catholicly admitted in the church, namely,  
 the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. If she  
 erred in this fact, confess her error; if she erred not, why  
 may not another particular church do as she did? A learned

<sup>r</sup> 3 Reg. xii. 27.      <sup>s</sup> Hos. iv. 15.

<sup>t</sup> Super hæreticis prona intelligentia est. S. Hieron. ibid.

<sup>u</sup> Non tamen cessavit Deus et populum hunc arguere per prophetas. Nam ibi extiterunt magni illi et insignes prophetae Elias et Elisæus, &c. S. August. de Civ. Dei, lib. xvii. c. 22.—Multi religiose intra se Dei cultum habebant, &c. De quo numero eorumve posteris

septem illa millia fuisse statuo, qui in persecutione sub Achabo Deum sibi ab idololatria immunes reservarunt, nec genua ante Baal flexerunt. Fran. Monceius, de Vit. Aureo, lib. i. c. 12.

<sup>x</sup> 3 Reg. xvii. sub Achabo.

<sup>y</sup> 4 Reg. iii. sub Jehoram filio Achabi.

<sup>z</sup> 3 Reg. xix. 18.

<sup>a</sup> Hos. ix. 17.

<sup>b</sup> 4 Reg. ix. 6.



Sect. 24. schoolman of yours saith she may: “<sup>c</sup>The church of Rome needed not to call the Grecians to agree upon this truth, since the authority of publishing it was in the church of Rome; especially since it is lawful for every particular church to promulgate that which is catholic.” Nor can you say he means catholic as foredetermined by the church in general; for so this point, when Rome added *Filioque* to the creed of a general council, was not. And how the Grecians were used in the after-council (such as it was) of Florence, is not to trouble this dispute; but catholic stands there for that which is so in the nature of it and fundamentally. Nor can you justly say that the church of Rome did or might do this by the pope’s authority over the church: for suppose he have that, and that his sentence be infallible, (I say, suppose both, but I give neither,) yet neither his authority nor his infallibility can belong unto him as the particular bishop of that see, but as the <sup>d</sup>ministerial head of the whole church. And you are all so lodged in this, that <sup>e</sup>Bellarmino professes he can neither tell the year when nor the pope under whom this addition was made. A particular church then, if you judge it by the school of Rome or the practice of Rome, may publish any thing that is catholic where the whole church is silent, and may therefore reform any thing that is not catholic where the whole church is negligent or will not.

III.—But you are as jealous of the honour of Rome as <sup>f</sup>Capellus is, who is angry with Baronius about certain canons in the second Milevitan council, and saith, “That he considered not of what consequence it was to grant to particular churches the power of making canons of faith without consulting the Roman see, which (as he saith, and you with him) was never lawful, nor ever done.” But suppose this were so,

<sup>c</sup> Non oportuit ad hoc eos vocare, quum autoritas fuerit publicandi apud ecclesiam Romanam, precipue cum unicuique etiam particulari ecclesie liceat, id quod catholicum est, promulgare. Alb. Magn. in 1. Dist. 11. A. 9.

<sup>d</sup> Non errare, convenit papæ, ut est caput. Bellarin. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3.

<sup>e</sup> De Christo, lib. ii. c. 21. §. Quando autem.—So *you* cannot find records of your own truths, which are far more likely to be kept; but when errors are

crept in, *we* must be bound to tell the place and the time, and I know not what, of their beginnings, or else they are not errors; as if some errors might not want a record as well as some truth.

<sup>f</sup> Omnino recte, nisi excepisset, &c. Nec consideravit quanti referat concedere ecclesiis particularibus jus condendorum canonum de fide, inconsulta Romana sede, quod nunquam licuit, nunquam factum est, &c. Capel. de Appellat. Eccl. Africanæ, c. 2 num. 12.

my speech was not *not consulting*, but in case of *neglecting* or *refusing*, or when the difficulty of time and place, or other circumstances, are such that a general council cannot be called, or not convene. For that the Roman see must be consulted with before any reformation be made, first, most certain it is Capellus can never prove, and secondly, as certain, that were it proved and practised we should have no reformation; for it would be long enough before the church should be cured if that see alone should be her physician, which in truth is her disease. Sect. 24.

IV.—Now if for all this you will say still that a provincial council will not suffice, but we should have borne with things till the time of a general council; first, it is true, a general council, free and entire, would have been the best remedy and most able for a gangrene that had spread so far and eaten so deep into Christianity. But what should we have suffered this gangrene to endanger life and all rather than be cured in time by a physician of a weaker knowledge and a less able hand! Secondly, we live to see since, if we had stayed and expected a general council, what manner of one we should have had, if any: for that at Trent was neither general nor free; and for the errors which Rome had contracted, it confirmed them, it cured them not. And yet I much doubt whether ever that council (such as it was) would have been called, if some provincial and national synods under supreme and regal power had not first set upon this great work of reformation; which I heartily wish had in all places been as orderly and happily pursued as the work was right Christian and good in itself; but human frailty, and the heats and distempers of men, as well as the cunning of the devil, would not suffer that. For even in this sense also, <sup>h</sup>*the wrath of man doth not accomplish the will of God*: but I have learned not to reject the good which God hath wrought for any evil which men may fasten to it.

V.—And yet if for all this you think it is better for us to be blind than to open our own eyes, let me tell you, very grave and learned men, and of your own party, have taught

§ Rex confitetur se vocasse concilium tertium Toletanum; quia decursis retro temporibus hæresis imminens in tota ecclesia catholica agere synodica negotia

denegabat, &c. Concil. Toletan. tertium, can. 1.

<sup>h</sup> James i. 20.

Sect. 24. me, that when the universal church will not, or for the iniquities of the times cannot, obtain and settle a free general council, it is lawful, nay, sometimes necessary, to reform gross abuses by a national or a provincial: for besides Alb. Magnus, whom I quoted <sup>i</sup> before, Gerson, the learned and devout chancellor of Paris, tells us plainly, “<sup>k</sup>That he will not deny but that the church may be reformed by parts; and that this is necessary; and that to effect it provincial councils may suffice, and in some things diocesan.” And again; “<sup>l</sup>Either you should reform all estates of the church in a general council, or command them to be reformed in provincial councils.” Now Gerson lived about two hundred years since. But this right of provincial synods, that they might decree in causes of faith, and in cases of reformation, where corruptions had crept into the sacraments of Christ, was practised much above a thousand years ago by many both national and provincial synods. For the <sup>m</sup> council at Rome under pope Sylvester, anno 324, condemned Photinus and Sabellius; (and their heresies were of high nature against the faith.) The <sup>n</sup> council at Gangra about the same time condemned Eustathius for his condemning of marriage as unlawful. The <sup>o</sup> first council at Carthage, being a provincial, condemned rebaptization, much about the year 348. The <sup>p</sup> provincial council at Aquileia, in the year 381, in which St. Ambrose was present, condemned Palladius and Secundinus for embracing the Arian heresy. The <sup>q</sup> second council of Carthage handled and decreed the belief and preaching of the Trinity; and this a little after the year 424. The <sup>r</sup> council of Milevis in Africa, in which St. Augustine was present, condemned the whole course of the heresy of Pelagius, that great and bewitching heresy, in the year 416. The <sup>s</sup> second council at Orange, a provincial too, handled the great con-

<sup>i</sup> Sect. 24. num. II.

<sup>k</sup> Nolo tamen dicere, quin in multis partibus possit ecclesia per suas partes reformari. Imo hoc necesse esset, sed ad hoc agendum sufficerent concilia provincialia, &c. Gerson. Tract. de Gen. Concil. unius obedientie, par. 1. pag. 222. F.

<sup>l</sup> Omnes ecclesie status aut in generali concilio reformatis, aut in conciliis provincialibus reformari mandetis. Gerson. Declarat. Defectuum Virorum Ec-

clesiasticorum, par. 1. pag. 209. B.

<sup>m</sup> Concil. Rom. 2. sub Sylvestro.

<sup>n</sup> Concil. Gang. can. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Concil. Carth. 1. can. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Concil. Aquiliens.

<sup>q</sup> Concil. Carth. 2. can. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Quaedam de causis fidei, unde nunc quæstio Pelagianorum imminet, in hoc cœtu sanctissimo primitus tractantur, &c. Aurel. Carthaginensis in Prefat. Concil. Milevit. apud Caranzam.

<sup>s</sup> Concil. Arausican. 2. can. 1, 2, &c.

roversies about grace and freewill, and set the church right Sect. 24. in them, in the year 444. The third council at Toledo (a national one), in the year 589, determined many things against the Arian heresy, about the very prime articles of faith, under fourteen several anathemas. The fourth council at Toledo did not only handle matters of faith for the reformation of that people, <sup>u</sup>but even added also some things to the Creed which were not expressly delivered in former creeds. Nay, the bishops did not only practise this to condemn heresies in national and provincial synods, and so reform those several places and the church itself by parts, but they did openly challenge this as their right and due, and that without any leave asked of the see of Rome: for in this fourth council of Toledo <sup>x</sup>they decree, “That if there happen a cause of faith to be settled, a general, that is, a national synod of all Spain and Galicia shall be held thereon;” and this in the year 643: where you see it was then catholic doctrine in all Spain that a national synod might be a competent judge in a cause of faith. And I would fain know what article of the faith doth more concern all Christians in general than that of *Filioque*? and yet the church of Rome herself made that addition to the Creed without a general council, as I have shewed <sup>y</sup>already. And if this were practised so often, and in so many places, why may not a national council of the church of England do the like?—as she did: for she cast off the pope’s usurpation, and, as much as in her lay, restored the king to his right. That appears by a <sup>z</sup>book subscribed by the bishops in Henry the Eighth’s time, and by the <sup>a</sup>records in the archbishop’s office, orderly kept, and to be seen. In the reformation which came after, our <sup>b</sup>princes had their parts, and the clergy theirs: and to these

<sup>t</sup> Concil. Tolet. 3.

<sup>u</sup> Quæ omnia in aliis symbolis explicite tradita non sunt. Concil. Tolet. 4. can. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Statuimus, ut saltem semel in anno a nobis concilium celebretur, ita tamen, ut si fidei causa est, aut quælibet alia ecclesiæ communis, generalis Hispaniæ et Galiciæ synodus celebretur, &c. Concil. Tolet. 4. can. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 24. num. II.

<sup>z</sup> The Institution of a Christian Man; printed an. 1534.

<sup>a</sup> In Synodo Londinensi, Sess. 8. Die Veneris, 29 Januarii an. 1562.

<sup>b</sup> And so in the reformation under Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxix., and under Josiah, 4 Reg. xxiii. And in the time of Reccaredus king of Spain the reformation there proceeded thus: Quum gloriosissimus princeps omnes regimini sui pontifices in unum conve-

Sect. 24. two principally the power and direction for reformation belongs. That our princes had their parts, is manifest by their calling together of the bishops and others of the clergy, to consider of that which might seem worthy reformation. And the clergy did their part: for being thus called together by regal power, they met in the national synod of sixty-two; and the articles there agreed on were afterwards confirmed by acts of state and the royal assent. In this synod the positive truths which are delivered are more than the polemics; so that a mere calumny it is, that we profess only a negative religion. True it is, and we must thank Rome for it, our confession must needs contain some negatives: for we cannot but deny that images are to be adored; nor can we admit maimed sacraments, nor grant prayers in an unknown tongue. And in a corrupt time or place it is as necessary in religion to deny falsehood as to assert and vindicate truth: indeed, this latter can hardly be well and sufficiently done but by the former; an affirmative verity being ever included in the negative to a falsehood. As for any error which might fall into this, (as any other reformation,) if any such can be found, then I say—and it is most true—reformation, especially in cases of religion, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many pretensions, that it is almost impossible but the reformers should step too far or fall too short in some smaller things or other, which, in regard of the far greater benefit coming by the reformation itself, may well be passed over and borne withal. But if there have been any wilful and gross errors, not so much in opinion as in fact, (c<sup>s</sup> sacrilege too often pretending to reform superstition,) that is the crime of the reformers, not of the reformation; and they are long since gone to God to answer it: to whom I leave them.

VI.—But now before I go off from this point I must put you in remembrance too that I spake at that time (and so must all that will speak of that exigent) of the general church

nire mandasset, &c. Concil. Tolet. 3. can. 1.—Cum convenissemus sacerdotes Domini apud urbem Toletanam, ut regis imperiis atque jussis commoniti, &c. Concil. Tolet. 4. in princ. apud Caranzani.—And both these synods did treat of matters of faith.

c Quisquis occasione hujus legis, quam

reges terræ Christo servientes ad emendandam vestram impietatem promulgaverunt, res proprias vestras cupide appetit, displicet nobis. Quisquis denique ipsas res pauperum, vel Basilicas congregationum, &c. non per justitiam, sed per avaritiam tenet, displicet nobis. S. August. Epist. 4<sup>8</sup>. versus finem.



as it was for the most part forced under the government of the Roman see: and this you understand well enough; for in your very next words you call it the Roman church. Now I make no doubt but that, as the universal catholic church would have reformed herself, had she been in all parts freed of the Roman yoke, so, while she was for the most in these western parts under that yoke, the church of Rome was, if not the only, yet the chief hinderance of reformation. And then in this sense it is more than clear, that if the Roman church will neither reform nor suffer reformation, it is lawful for any other particular church to reform itself, so long as it doth it peaceably and orderly, and keeps itself to the foundation and free from <sup>d</sup>sacrilege.

Q. I asked, *Quo judice* did this appear to be so? which question I asked as not thinking it equity that protestants in their own cause should be accusers, witnesses, and judges of the Roman church.

A. I.—You do well to tell the reason now why you asked this question; for you did not discover it at the conference; if you had, you might then have received your answer. It is most true, no man in common equity ought to be suffered to be accuser, witness, and judge in his own cause; but is there not as little reason, and equity too, that any man that is to be accused should be the accused, and yet witness and judge in his own cause? If the first may hold, no man shall be innocent; and if the last, none will be nocent. And what do we here with “in their own cause against the Roman church?” Why, is it not your own too against the protestant church? And if it be a cause common to both, as certain it is, then neither part alone may be judge: if neither alone may judge, then either they must be judged by a <sup>e</sup>third, which stands indifferent to both, and that is the scripture, or, if there be a jealousy or doubt of the sense of the scripture, they must either both repair to the exposition of the primitive church, and submit to that, or both call and submit to a general

<sup>d</sup> And this a particular church may do, but not a schism; for a schism can never be peaceable nor orderly, and seldom free from sacrilege. Out of which respects, (it may be,) as well as for the

grievousness of the crime, St Augustine calls it *sacrilegium schismatis*, De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 8; for usually they go together.

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 21. num. IX.



Sect. 25. council, which shall be lawfully called, and fairly and freely held with indifferency to all parties, and that must judge the difference according to scripture, which must be their rule as well as private men's.

A. C. p. 58. II.—And here, after some loud cry against the pride and insolent madness of the protestants, A. C. adds, “That the church of Rome is the principal and mother-church; and that therefore, though it be against common equity that subjects and children should be accusers, witnesses, judges, and executioners against their prince and mother in any case, yet it is not absurd that in some cases the prince or mother may accuse, witness, judge, and, if need be, execute justice against unjust and rebellious subjects or evil children.” How far forth Rome is a prince over the whole church, or a mother of it, will come to be shewed at after. In the mean time, though I cannot grant her to be either, yet let us suppose her to be both, that A. C.'s argument may have all the strength it can have: nor shall it force me (as plausible as it seems) to weaken the just power of princes over their subjects, or of mothers over their children, to avoid the shock of this argument: for though A. C. may tell us it is not absurd in some cases, yet I would fain have him name any one moderate prince that ever thought it just or took it upon him to be accuser, and witness, and judge, in any cause of moment against his subjects, but that the law had liberty to judge between them. For the great philosopher tells us, “<sup>f</sup>That the chief magistrate is *custos juris*, the guardian and keeper of the law; and if of the law, then both of that equity and equality which is due unto them that are under him.” And even Tiberius himself, in the cause of Silanus, when Dolabella would have flattered him into more power than in wisdom he thought fit then to take to himself, he put him off thus: No, “<sup>g</sup>the laws grow less where such power enlarges; nor is absolute power to be used where there may be an orderly proceeding by law.” And for <sup>h</sup>parents, it is true, when children are young they may chastise them without other accuser or witness than themselves, and yet the children are to give

<sup>f</sup> Ἐστί δὲ ὁ ἄρχων φύλαξ τοῦ δικαίου  
εἰ δὲ τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ τοῦ ἴσου. Arist.  
Eth. c. 6.

nec utendum imperio, ubi legibus agi  
possit. Tacit. Ann. lib. iii.

<sup>h</sup> Heb. xii. 9.

<sup>g</sup> Minni jura quietes gliscat potestas,

them reverence: and it is presumed that natural affection will prevail so far with them that they will not punish them too much; for all experience tells us (almost to the loss of education) they punish them too little, even when there is cause: yet when children are grown up and come to some full use of their own reason, the apostle's rule is, <sup>k</sup>Colos. iii. *Parents, provoke not your children*; and if the apostle prevail not with froward parents, there is a magistrate and a law to relieve even a son against <sup>l</sup>unnatural parents: as it was in the case of T. Manlius against his over-imperious father. And an express law there was among the Jews<sup>m</sup> when children were grown up and fell into great extremities, that the parents should then bring them to the magistrate, and not be too busy in such cases with their own power. So suppose Rome be a prince, yet her subjects must be tried by God's law the scripture; and suppose her a mother, yet there is or ought to be remedy against her for her children that are grown up, if she forget all good nature and turn stepdame to them.

III.—Well; the reason why the Jesuit asked the question, *Quo jndice?* who should be judge? he says, was this; because there is no equity in it that the protestants should be judges in their own cause. But now upon more deliberation A. C. tells us, (as if he knew the Jesuit's mind as well as <sup>A. C. p. 57.</sup> himself, as sure I think he doth,) “That the Jesuit directed this question chiefly against that speech of mine, that there were errors in doctrine of faith, and that in the general church, as the Jesuit understood my meaning.” The Jesuit here took my meaning right; for I confess I said there were errors in doctrine, and dangerous ones too, in the church of Rome: I said likewise, that when the general church could not or would not reform such, it was lawful for particular churches to reform themselves. But then I added, “That

<sup>i</sup> God used Samuel as a messenger against Eli for his overmuch indulgence to his sons, 1 Sam. iii. 13; and yet Samuel himself committed the very same fault concerning his own sons, 1 Sam. viii. 3, 5. And this indulgence occasioned the change of the civil government, as the former was the loss of the priesthood.

<sup>k</sup> Colos. iii. 21.

<sup>l</sup> Crimini ei tribunus inter cætera dabat, quod filium juvenem nullius probri compertum, extorrem urbe, domo, penatibus, foro, luce, congressu æqualium prohibitum, in opus servile, prope in carcerem, atque in ergastulum dederit. Liv. dec. 1. l. 7.

<sup>m</sup> Deut. xxi. 19

sect. 25. the general church (not universally taken, but in these western parts) fell into those errors, being swayed in these latter ages by the predominant power of the church of Rome, under whose government it was for the most part forced." And all men of understanding know how oft and how easily an overpotent member carries the whole with it in any body, natural, politic, or ecclesiastical.

A. C. p. 57. IV.—Yea, but A. C. tells us, "That never any competent judge did so censure the church, and indeed that no power on earth or in hell itself can so far prevail against the general church as to make it err generally in any one point of divine truth, and much less to teach any thing by its full authority to be a matter of faith which is contrary to divine truth expressed or involved in scriptures rightly understood; and that therefore no reformation of faith can be needful in the general church, but only in particular churches." And for proof of this he cites St. Matt. xvi. and xxviii., St. Luke xxii., St. John xiv. and xvi. In this troublesome and quarrelling age I am most unwilling to meddle with the erring of the church in general; the church of England is content to pass that over; and though <sup>n</sup>she tells us that the church of Rome hath erred even in matters of faith, yet of the erring of the church in general she is modestly silent. But since A. C. will needs have it that the whole church did never generally err in any one point of faith, he should do well to distinguish before he be so peremptory: for if he mean no more than that the whole universal church of Christ cannot universally err in any one point of faith simply necessary to all men's salvation, he fights against no adversary, that I know, but his own fiction; for the most <sup>o</sup>learned protestants grant it: but if he mean that the whole church cannot err in any one point of divine truth in general, which, though by sundry consequences deduced from the principles, is yet made a point of faith, and may prove dangerous to the salvation of some which believe it and practise after it, (as his words seem to import,) especially if in these the church shall presume to

<sup>n</sup> Art. XIX.

<sup>o</sup> Si demus errare non posse ecclesiam in rebus ad salutem necessariis, hic sensus noster est: Ideo hoc esse, quia abdicata omni sua sapientia, a

Spiritu Sancto doceri se per verbum Dei patitur. Calvin. Inst. lib. iv. c. 8. §. 13. And this also is our sense. Vide sup. §. 21. num. V.

determine without her proper guide, the scripture, as <sup>P</sup>Bel-Sect. 25. larmine says she may and yet not err; then perhaps it may be said, and without any wrong to the catholic church, that the whole militant church hath erred in such a point of divine truth and of faith: nay, A. C. confesses expressly in his very A. C. p. 58 next words, "That the whole church may at some time not know all divine truths, which afterwards it may learn by study of scripture and otherwise." So then in A. C.'s judgment the whole militant church may at some time not know all divine truths. Now that which knows not all must be ignorant of some, and that which is ignorant of some may possibly err in one point or other: the rather, because he confesses the knowledge of it must be got by learning; and learners may mistake and err, especially where the lesson is divine truth out of scripture, out of difficult scripture: for were it of plain and easy scripture that he speaks, the whole church could not at any time be without the knowledge of it; and for aught I yet see, the whole church militant hath no greater warrant against not erring in than against not knowing of the points of divine truth; for in <sup>9</sup>St. John xvi. there is as large a promise to the church of knowing all points of divine truth, as A. C. or any Jesuit can produce for her not erring in any; and if she may be ignorant or mistaken in learning of any point of divine truth, doubtless in that state of ignorance she may both err and teach her error, yea, and teach that to be divine truth which is not; nay, perhaps teach that as a matter of divine truth which is contrary to divine truth, always provided it be not in any point simply fundamental, of which the whole catholic church cannot be ignorant, and in which it cannot err, as hath before been proved.<sup>r</sup>

V.—As for the places of scripture which A. C. cites to A. C. p. 57. prove that the whole church cannot err generally in any one point of divine truth, be it fundamental or not, they are known places all of them, and are alleged by A. C. A. C. p. 57. three several times in this short tract and to three several

<sup>P</sup> Nostra sententia est, ecclesiam absolute non posse errare, nec in rebus absolute necessariis, nec in aliis quæ credenda vel facienda nobis proponit, sive habeantur expresse in scripturis,

sive non. Bellarm. de Eccl. Milit. lib. iii. c. 14. §. 5.  
<sup>9</sup> John xvi. 13.  
<sup>r</sup> Sect. 21. num. V.

Sect. 25. purposes; here, to prove that the universal church cannot  
 A. C. p. 53. err; before this, to prove that the tradition of the present  
 church cannot err; after this, to prove that the pope cannot  
 A. C. p. 58. err. He should have done well to have added these places a  
 and 73. fourth time to prove that general councils cannot err; for so  
 doth both <sup>s</sup>Stapleton and <sup>t</sup>Bellarmino. Sure A. C. and his  
 fellows are hard driven when they must fly to the same places  
 for such different purposes; for a pope may err where a  
 council doth not, and a general council may err where the  
 catholic church cannot; and therefore it is not likely that  
 these places should serve alike for all. The first place is  
 St. Matthew xvi.;<sup>u</sup> there Christ told St. Peter, and we  
 believe it most assuredly, that *hell-gates shall never be able to*  
*prevail against his church*; but that is, that they shall not  
 prevail to make the church catholic apostatize and fall quite  
 away from Christ, or err in absolute fundamentals, which  
 amounts to as much. But the promise reaches not to this,  
 that the church shall never err, no, not in the lightest matters  
 of faith: for it will not follow, hell-gates shall not prevail  
 against the church, therefore hellish devils shall not tempt  
 or assault and batter it. And thus St. Augustine<sup>x</sup> under-  
 stood the place: "It may fight, (yea and be wounded too,) but  
 it cannot be wholly overcome." And Bellarmine himself ap-  
 plies it to prove <sup>y</sup>that the visible church of Christ cannot  
*deficere*, err so as quite to fall away. Therefore in his judg-  
 ment this is a true and a safe sense of this text of scripture.  
 But as for not erring at all in any point of divine truth, and  
 so making the church absolutely infallible, that is neither  
 a true nor a safe sense of this scripture. And it is very  
 remarkable, that whereas this text hath been so much beaten  
 upon by writers of all sorts, there is no one Father of the  
 church for twelve hundred years after Christ (the counterfeit  
 or partial decretals of some popes excepted) that ever con-  
 cluded the infallibility of the church out of this place; but her  
 non-deficiency, that hath been and is justly deduced hence:  
 and here I challenge A. C. and all that party to shew the

<sup>s</sup> Stapl. Relect. præf. ad lectorem.

<sup>t</sup> Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Matt. xvi. 18.

<sup>x</sup> Pugnare potest, expugnari non pot-

est. S. August. *l.* de Symb. ad Cate-  
 cum. c. 6.

<sup>y</sup> Bellarm. de Eccl. Milit. lib. iii.  
 c. 13. §. 1. &c.



contrary if they can. The next place of scripture is <sup>z</sup>St. Sect. 25. Matthew xxviii., the promise of Christ that *he will be with them to the end of the world*. But this, in the general voice of the Fathers<sup>a</sup> of the church, is a promise of assistance and protection, not of an infallibility of the church. And <sup>b</sup>pope Leo himself enlarges this presence and providence of Christ to all those things which he committed to the execution of his ministers; but no word of infallibility is to be found there: and indeed since Christ, according to his promise, is present with his ministers in all these things, and that one and a chief of these *all* is the preaching of his word to the people; it must follow that Christ should be present with all his ministers that preach his word to make them infallible, which daily experience tells us is not so. The third place urged by A. C. is <sup>c</sup>St. Luke xxii., where the prayer of Christ will effect no more than his promise hath performed; neither of them implying an infallibility for or in the church against all errors whatsoever. And this almost all his own side confess is spoken either of St. Peter's person only, or of him and his successors <sup>d</sup>both. Of the church it is not spoken, and therefore cannot prove an unerring power in it: for how can that place prove the church cannot err which speaks not at all of the church? And it is observable too, that when the divines of Paris expounded this place that Christ here prayed for St. Peter as he represented the whole catholic church, and obtained for it that the faith of the catholic church *nunquam deficeret*, should never so err as quite to fall away, <sup>e</sup>Bellarmino is so stiff for the pope that he says expressly, "This exposition of the Parisians is false," and that this text cannot be meant of the catholic church. Not be meant of it! then certainly it ought not to be alleged as proof of it, as here it is by A. C. The fourth place named by A. C. is <sup>f</sup>St. John A. C. p. 57.

<sup>z</sup> Matt. xxviii. 21.

<sup>a</sup> S. Hil. in Psal. cxxiv.—Prosp. de Vocat. Gent. lib. ii. c. 2.—Leo, Sermon. 2. de Resur. Dom. c. 3. et Ep. 31.—Isidor. in Jos. 12.

<sup>b</sup> In omnibus quæ ministris suis commisit exequenda. S. Leo, Epist. 91. c. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Luke xxii. 32.

<sup>d</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3. §. Est igitur tertia. He understood the

place of both St. Peter and his successors.

<sup>e</sup> Quæ expositio falsa est, primo quia, &c. Bellarm. ibid. §. 2. And he says it is false, because the Parisians expounded it of the church only: Volunt enim pro sola ecclesia esse oratum. Ibid. §. 1.

<sup>f</sup> John xiv. 16, 17.



Sect. 25. xiv., and the consequent place to it, <sup>g</sup>St. John xvi. These places contain another promise of Christ concerning the coming of the Holy Ghost. Thus: *That the Comforter shall abide with them for ever: that this Comforter is the Spirit of truth; and that this Spirit of truth will lead them into all truth.* Now this promise, as it is applied to the church consisting of all believers which are and have been since Christ appeared in the flesh, including the apostles, is <sup>h</sup>absolute and without any restriction; for the Holy Ghost did lead them into all truth, so that no error was to be found in that church; but, as it is applicable to the whole church militant in all succeeding times, so the promise was made with a limitation, <sup>i</sup>namely, that the blessed Spirit should abide with the church for ever and lead it into all truth; but not simply into all curious truth, no not in or about the faith, but into all truth necessary to salvation: and against this truth the whole catholic church cannot err, keeping herself to the direction of the scripture as Christ hath appointed her; for in this very place where the promise is made, that the *Holy Ghost shall teach you all things*, it is added, that *he shall bring all things to their remembrance.* What! simply all things? No, but all things which Christ had told them, <sup>k</sup>St. John xiv.; so there is a limitation put upon the words by Christ himself: and if the church will not err, it must not ravel curiously into unnecessary truths which are out of the promise, nor follow any other guide than the doctrine which Christ hath left behind him to govern it: for if it will come to the end, it must keep in the way. And Christ, who promised the Spirit should lead, hath nowhere promised that it shall follow its leader into all truth; and at least not infallibly, unless you will limit as before: so no one of these places can make good A. C.'s assertion, "That the whole church cannot err generally in any one point of divine truth;" in absolute foundations <sup>l</sup>she cannot, in deductions and superstructures she may.

<sup>g</sup> John xvi. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Field. de Eccles. lib. iv. c. 2, free from all error and ignorance of divine things.

<sup>i</sup> And Theodoret proceeds further, and says, Neque divini prophetæ, neque

mirabiles apostoli omnia præciverunt. Quæcunque enim expetiebant, ea illis significavit gratia Spiritus. Theod. in

<sup>l</sup> Tim. iii. 14, 15.

<sup>k</sup> John xiv. 26.

<sup>l</sup> Sect. 21 num. V.

VI.—Now to all that I have said concerning the right Sect. 25.  
 which particular churches have to reform themselves when  
 the general church cannot for impediments, or will not for  
 negligence, which I have proved at large <sup>m</sup>before, all the  
 answer that A. C. gives is, first, *Quo jndice?* who shall be A. C. p. 57.  
 judge?—And that shall be the scripture and the <sup>n</sup>primitive  
 church; and by the rules of the one, and to the integrity of  
 the other, both in faith and manners, any particular church  
 may safely reform itself.

VII.—Secondly, “That no reformation in faith can be  
 needful in the general church, but only in particular churches.  
 In which case also (he saith) particular churches may not A. C. p. 58.  
 take upon them to judge and condemn others of errors in  
 faith.” Well, how far forth reformation even of faith may  
 be necessary in the general church, I have expressed <sup>o</sup>already:  
 and for particular churches, I do not say that they must take  
 upon them to judge or condemn others of error in faith;  
 that which I say is, they may reform themselves. Now I  
 hope to reform themselves and to condemn others are two  
 different works, unless it fall out so that by reforming them-  
 selves they do by consequence condemn any other that is  
 guilty in that point in which they reform themselves; and so  
 far to judge and condemn others is not only lawful but neces-  
 sary. A man that lives religiously doth not by and by sit in  
 judgment and condemn with his mouth all profane livers;  
 but yet while he is silent his very life condemns them: and I  
 hope in this way of judicature A. C. dares not say it is un-  
 lawful for a particular church or man to condemn another;  
 and further, whatsoever A. C. can say to the contrary, there  
 are divers cases, where heresies are known and notorious, in  
 which it will be hard to say (as he doth) that one particular A. C. p. 58.  
 church must not judge or condemn another, so far forth at  
 least as to abhor and protest against the heresy of it.

VIII.—Thirdly, if one particular church may not judge or  
 condemn another, what must then be done where particulars

<sup>m</sup> Sect. 24. num. I. II. &c.

<sup>n</sup> Si de modica questione disceptatio  
 esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas  
 recurrere ecclesias, in quibus apostoli  
 conversati sunt, et ab iis de presenti  
 questione sumere quod certum et liqui-

dum est? Quid autem si neque apo-  
 stoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis,  
 nonne oportebat ordinem sequi tradi-  
 tionis, &c. Irenæus advers. Hæres. lib.  
 viii. c. 4.

<sup>o</sup> Sect. 25. num. IV.

Sect. 25.  
A. C. p. 58.

need reformation? What! why then A. C. tells us, "That particular churches must in that case (as Irenæus intimateth) have recourse to the church of Rome, which hath more powerful principality, and to Pher bishop, who is chief pastor of the whole church, as being St. Peter's successor, to whom Christ promised the keys, St. Matt. xvi., for whom he prayed that his faith might not fail, St. Luke xxii., and whom he charged to feed and govern the whole flock, St. John xxi. And this (A. C. tells us) he shall never refuse to do in such sort as that this neglect shall be a just cause for any particular man or church, under pretence of reformation in manners or faith, to make a schism or separation from the whole general church."

IX.—Well, first, you see where A. C. would have us: "If any particular churches differ in points of divine truth, they must not judge or condemn each other," saith he. No, take heed of that in any case; that is the office of the universal church. And yet he will have it that Rome, which is but a particular church, must and ought to judge all other particulars.

X.—Secondly, he tells us this is so, "because the church of Rome hath more powerful principality than other particular churches, and that her bishop is pastor of the whole church." To this I answer, that it is most true indeed, the church of Rome hath had, and hath yet, more powerful principality than any other particular church, but she hath not this power from Christ: the Roman patriarch, by ecclesiastical constitutions, might, perhaps, have a primacy of order; but for principality of power, the patriarchs were as even, as equal, as the 9apostles were before them. The truth is, this "more

P And after he saith, p. 58, "That the bishop of Rome is and ought to be the judge of particular churches in this case."

¶ Summa potestas ecclesiastica non est data solum Petro, sed etiam aliis apostolis. Omnes enim poterant dicere illud S. Pauli, *sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, &c. 2 Cor. xi. 28. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. i. c. 9. §. Respondeo pontificatum.—Where then is the difference between St. Peter and the rest? In this, saith Bellarmine, *ibid.*, Quia hæc potestas data est Petro, ut ordinario pastori, cui perpetuo succederetur;

alii vero tanquam delegatis, quibus non succederetur. This is handsomely said to men easy of belief: but that the highest power ecclesiastical, confessed to be given to the other apostles as well as to St. Peter, was given to St. Peter only, as to an ordinary pastor, whose successors should have the same power, which the successors of the rest should not have, can never be proved out of scripture; nay, (I will give them their own latitude,) it can never be proved by any tradition of the whole catholic church: and till it be proved, Bellarmine's handsome expression cannot be

powerful principality” the Roman bishops <sup>r</sup>got under the emperors after they became Christians; and they used the matter so that they grew big enough to oppose, nay, to depose the emperors, by the same power which they had given them. And after this, other particular churches, especially here in the west, submitted themselves to them for succour and protection’s sake. And this was one main cause which swelled Rome into this more powerful principality, and not any right given by Christ to make that <sup>s</sup>prelate pastor of the whole church. I know Bellarmine makes much ado about it, and will needs fetch it out of <sup>t</sup>St. Augustine, who says indeed that “in the church of Rome there did always flourish the principality of an apostolic chair;” or, if you will, the apostolic chair in relation to the west and south parts of the church, all the other four apostolic chairs being in the east. Now this no man denies that understands the state and story of the church; and <sup>u</sup>Calvin confesses it expressly: nor is the word *principatus* so great, nor were the bishops of those times so little, as that *principes* and *principatus* are not commonly given them both by the <sup>x</sup>Greek and the Latin Fathers of this great and learnedest age of the church, made up of the fourth and fifth hundred years; always understanding *principatus* of their spiritual power, and within the limits of their several jurisdictions, which perhaps now and then they did occasionally exceed. And there is not one word in St. Augustine, That this principality of the apostolic chair in the church of Rome was then, or ought to be now, exercised over the whole church of Christ, as Bellar-

Sect. 25.

believed by me; for St. Cyprian hath told me long since that *episcopatus unus est* (for as much as belongs to the calling) as well as *apostolatus*. Lib. de simp. Prælato.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 25. num. XII.

<sup>s</sup> De Rom. Pont. lib. i. c. 9. §. Augustinus epistola.

<sup>t</sup> Epist. 162. In Romana ecclesia semper apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus.

<sup>u</sup> Quia opinio invaluit fundatam esse hanc ecclesiam a S. Petro; itaque in occidente sedes apostolica honoris causa vocabatur. Calv. lib. iv. c. 6. §. 16.

<sup>x</sup> Princeps ecclesiæ, S. Hilar. de Trin. lib. viii. princ. And he speaks of a

bishop in general, Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 17. Aseribuntur episcopo *δυσπτεία, βῆμα, καὶ ἀρχή*, imperium, thronus, et principatus ad regimen animarum. Et *τοιαύτη ἀρχή*, hujusmodi imperium.— And he also speaks of a bishop, Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 20. Nor were these any titles of pride in bishops then; for St. Greg. Nazianzen, who challenges these titles to himself, Orat. 17, was so devout, so mild, and so humble, that rather than the peace of the church should be broken, he freely resigned the great patriarchate of Constantinople, and retired; and this in the first council of Constantinople, and the second general.

Sect. 25. mine insinuates there, and as A. C. would have it here. And to prove that St. Augustine did not intend by *principatus* here to give the Roman bishop any power out of his own limits, (which, God knows, were far short of the whole church,) I shall make it most manifest out of the very same epistle. For afterwards, saith St. Augustine, when the pertinacy of the Donatists could not be restrained by the African bishops only, “<sup>y</sup> they gave them leave to be heard by foreign bishops.” And after that he hath these words: “<sup>z</sup> And yet peradventure Melciades, the bishop of the Roman church, with his colleagues the transmarine bishops, *non debuit*, ought not to usurp to himself this judgment, which was determined by seventy African bishops, Tigisitanus sitting primate. And what will you say if he did not usurp this power? for the emperor being desired sent bishops judges, which should sit with him and determine what was just upon the whole cause.” In which passage there are very many things observable. As, first, that the Roman prelate came not in till there was leave for them to go to transmarine bishops. Secondly, that if the pope had come in without this leave, it had been an usurpation. Thirdly, that when he did thus come in, not by his own proper authority, but by leave, there were other bishops made judges with him. Fourthly, that these other bishops were appointed and sent by the emperor and his power;—that which the pope will least of all endure. Lastly, lest the pope and his adherents should say this was an usurpation in the emperor, <sup>a</sup>St. Augustine tells us a little before, in the same epistle still, that “this doth chiefly belong *ad curam ejus*, to the emperor’s care and charge, and that he is to give an account to God for it.” And Melciades did sit and judge the business with all Christian prudence and moderation. So at this time the Roman prelate was not received as pastor of the whole church, say A. C. what he please: nor had he any supremacy over the other patriarchs: and for

<sup>y</sup> Pergant ad fratres et collegas nostros transmarinarum ecclesiarum episcopos, &c. S. August. Ep. 162.

<sup>z</sup> An forte non debuit Romanæ ecclesie Melciades episcopus cum collegis transmarinis episcopis illud sibi usurpare judicium quod ab Afris septuaginta, ubi prius Tigisitanus præsedit,

fuerit terminatum? Quid quod nec ipse usurpavit: rogatus quippe imperator, judices misit episcopos, qui cum eo sederent, et de tota illa causa, quod justum videretur, statuerent, &c. S. Aug. ibid.

<sup>a</sup> Ad cujus curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus est, res illa maxime pertinebat. S. August. Ep. 162.



this, were all other records of antiquity silent, the civil law is proof enough, (and that is a monument of the primitive church.) The text there is, <sup>b</sup>*A patriarcha non datur appellatio*, “from a patriarch there lies no appeal.” No appeal—therefore every patriarch was alike supreme in his own patriarchate; therefore the pope then had no supremacy over the whole church; therefore certainly not then received as universal pastor. And St. Gregory himself, speaking of appeals, and expressly citing the laws themselves, says plainly, “<sup>c</sup>That the patriarch is to put a final end to those causes which come before him by appeal from bishops and archbishops:” but then he adds, “<sup>d</sup>That where there is nor metropolitan nor patriarch of that diocess, there they are to have recourse to the see apostolic, as being the head of all churches.” Where, first, this implies plainly, that if there be a metropolitan or a patriarch in those churches, his judgment is final, and there ought to be no appeal to Rome. Secondly, it is as plain, that in those ancient times of the church government Britain was never subject to the see of Rome; for it was one of the <sup>e</sup>six diocesses of the west empire, and had a primate of its own: nay, <sup>f</sup>John Capgrave, one of your own, and learned for those times, and long before him William of Malmsbury, tell us that “pope Urban the Second, at the council held at Bari in Apulia, accounted my worthy predecessor St. Anselm as his own compeer, and said he was the apostolic and patriarch of the other world,” (so he then termed this island.) Now the Britons having a primate of their own, (which is greater than a metropolitan,) yea, a <sup>g</sup>patriarch, if you will, he could not be appealed from to

<sup>b</sup> Nam contra horum antistitum (de patriarchis loquitur) sententias, non esse locum appellationi a majoribus nostris constitutum est. Cod. L. 1. tit. 4. l. 29. ex editione Gothofredi.—Si non rata habuerit utraque pars, quæ judicata sunt, tunc beatissimus patriarcha dioceseos illius, inter eos audiat, &c. Nulla parte ejus sententiæ contradicere valente. Authen. Collat. 9. tit. 15. c. 22.

<sup>c</sup> Et ille (scilicet patriarcha) secundum canones, et leges præbeat finem. And there he cites the novel itself. S. Greg. lib. xi. Indict. 2. Ep. 54.

<sup>d</sup> Si dictum fuerit, quod nec metropolitanum habeat, nec patriarcham: dicendum est, quod a sede apostolica, quæ

omnium ecclesiarum caput est, causa audienda est, &c. S. Greg. ibid.

<sup>e</sup> Notitia provinciarum occidentalium, per Guidum Pancirolum, lib. ii. c. 48.

<sup>f</sup> Hunc cunctis liberalium artium disciplinis eruditum; pro magistro teneamus, et quasi comparem, velut alterius orbis apostolicum et patriarcham, &c. Jo. Capgravius de Vitis Sanctorum, in Vita S. Anselmi; et Guil. Malmsburiens. de Gestis Pontificum Anglorum. p. 223. edit. Francof. 1601.

<sup>g</sup> Ibi (Cantuariæ id est) prima sedes archiepiscopi habetur, qui est totius Angliæ primas et patriarcha. Guil. Malmsburiensis in Prolog. lib. i. de Gestis Pontificum Anglorum, p. 195.



Sect. 25. Rome, by St. Gregory's own doctrine. Thirdly, it will be hard for any man to prove there were any churches then in the world which were not under some either patriarch or metropolitan. Fourthly, if any such were, it is *gratis dictum*, and impossible to be proved, that all such churches, wherever seated in the world, were obliged to depend on Rome; for manifest it is that the bishops which were ordained in places without the limits of the Roman empire (which places they commonly called <sup>b</sup> barbarous) were all to be ordained, and therefore most probable to be governed by the patriarch of Constantinople. And for Rome's being the head of all churches, I have said enough to that in divers parts of this discourse.

XI.—And since I am thus fallen upon the church of Afric, I shall borrow another reason from the practice of that church, why by *principatus* St. Augustine neither did nor could mean any principality of the church, or bishop of Rome over the whole church of Christ. For, as the acts of councils and stories go, the African prelates finding that all succeeding popes were not of Meleades his temper, set themselves to assert their own liberties, and held it out stoutly against Zozimus, Boniface the First, and Cœlestine the First, who were successively popes of Rome. At last it was concluded, in the sixth council of Carthage, (wherein were assembled two hundred and seventeen bishops, of which St. Augustine himself was one,) that they would not give way to such a manifest encroachment upon their rights and liberties; and thereupon gave present notice to pope Cœlestine to forbear sending his officers amongst them, “lest he should seem to induce the swelling pride of the world into the church of Christ.” And this is said to have amounted into a formal separation from the church of Rome, and to have continued for the space of somewhat more than one hundred years. Now that such a separation there was of the African church from Rome, and a reconciliation after, stands upon the credit

<sup>b</sup> Præterea et qui sunt ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς, in barbarico, episcopi a sanctissimo throno sanctissimæ Constantino-politanæ ecclesiæ ordinentur. Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ universæ. Can. 206. And Justellus proves it there at large, that by *in barbarico*, in that canon,

is meant *in solo barbarorum*. Annot. ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Ne fumosum typhum seculi in ecclesiam Christi videatur inducere, &c. Epist. Concil. Afric. ad Papam Cælestinum Primum. Apud Nicolin. Concil. tom. i. p. 844.

and authority of two public instruments extant both among the ancient councils: the one is an <sup>k</sup>Epistle from Boniface the Second, in whose time the reconciliation to Rome is said to be made by Eulalius, then bishop of Carthage, but the separation *instigante diabolo*, by the temptation of the devil; the other is an <sup>l</sup>*Exemplar Precum*, or copy of the petition of the same Eulalius, in which he damns and curses all those his predecessors which went against the church of Rome: amongst which Eulalius must needs curse St. Augustine; and pope Boniface, accepting this submission, must acknowledge that St. Augustine and the rest of that council deserved this curse, and died under it, as violating *rectæ fidei regulam*, the rule of the right faith, (so the *Exemplar Precum* begins,) by refusing the pope's authority. I will not deny but that there are divers reasons given by the learned Romanists and reformed writers for and against the truth and authority of both these instruments: but because this is too long to be examined here, I will say but this, and then make my use of it to my present purpose, giving the church of Rome free leave to acknowledge these instruments to be true or false, as they please: that which I shall say is this; These instruments are let stand in all editions of the councils and epistles decretal; as for example, in the old edition by Isidore, anno 1524; and in another old edition of them printed anno 1530; and in that which was published by P. Crabbe, anno 1538; and in the edition of Valentinus Joverius, anno 1555; and in that by Surius, anno 1567; and in the edition at Venice, by Nicolinus, anno 1585: and in all of these without any note or censure upon them. And they are in the edition of Binius too, anno 1618; but there is a censure upon them, to keep a quarter, it may be, with <sup>m</sup>Baronius, who was the first (I think) that ever quarrelled them, and he doth it tartly. And since, <sup>n</sup>Bellarmino follows the same way, but more doubtfully. This is that which I had to say. And the use which I shall make of these instruments, whether they be

<sup>k</sup> Epist. Bonifacii II. apud Nicol. Concil. tom. ii. p. 544.

<sup>l</sup> Exemp. Precum apud Nicolin. ibid. p. 525.

<sup>m</sup> Baron. Annal. an. ad 419. num. 93, 94.

<sup>n</sup> Valde mihi illæ epistolæ suspectæ sunt. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 25. §. Respondeo primum.—Sed si forte illæ epistolæ veræ sunt, nihil enim affirmo, &c. Ibid. §. ult.

Sect. 25. true or false, is this: They are either true or false, that is of necessity. If they be false, then Boniface the Second, and his accomplices at Rome, or some for them, are notorious forgers, and that of records of great consequence concerning the government and peace of the whole church of Christ, and to the perpetual infamy of that see; and all this foolishly, and to no purpose: for if there were no such separation as these records mention of the African churches from the Roman, to what end should Boniface, or any other, counterfeit an epistle of his own, and a submission of Eulalius? On the other side, if these instruments be true, (as the sixth council of Carthage, against all other arguments, makes me incline to believe they are, in substance at least, though perhaps not in all circumstances,) then it is manifest that the church of Afric separated from the church of Rome; that this separation continued above one hundred years; that the church of Afric made this separation in a national council of their own, which had in it two hundred and seventeen bishops; that this separation was made (for aught appears) only because they at Rome were too ready to entertain appeals from the church of Afric, as appears in the case of °Appiarius, who then appealed thither; that St. Augustine, Eugenius, Fulgentius, and all those bishops and other martyrs which suffered in the Vandalic persecution, died in the time of this separation; that if this separation were not just, but a schism, then these famous Fathers of the church died (for aught appears) in actual and unrepented schism, † and out of the church; and if so, then how comes St. Augustine to be and be accounted a saint all over the Christian world, and at Rome itself? But if the separation were just, then is it far more lawful for the church of England by a national council to cast off the pope's usurpation (as † she did) than it was for the African church to separate; because then the African church excepted only against the pride of Rome † in case of

° And so the council of Carthage sent word to pope Cœlestine plainly, that in admitting such appeals he brake the decrees of the council of Nice. Epist. Concil. Afric. ad Cœlestinum, c. 105. apud Nicol. Conc. tom. i. p. 844.

† Plane ex ecclesie catholicae albo expungenda fuissent sanctorum Africa-

norum martyrum agmina, qui in persecutione Vandalica pro fide catholica, &c. Baron. Annal. an. 419. num. 93. et Binius in Notis ad Epist. Bonifacii II. ad Eulalium.

‡ Sect. 24. num. V.

‡ Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 25. §. 2.

appeals, and two other canons less material, but the church of England excepts (besides this grievance) against many corruptions in doctrine belonging to the faith, with which Rome at that time of the African separation was not tainted. And I am out of all doubt that St. Augustine and those other famous men in their generations durst not thus have separated from Rome, had the pope had that powerful principality over the whole church of Christ, and that by Christ's own ordinance and institution, as A. C. pretends he had. Sect. 25.

XII.—I told you a little <sup>s</sup>before that the popes grew under the emperors till they had overgrown them: and now, lest A. C. should say I speak it without proof, I will give you a brief touch of the church story in that behalf, and that from the beginning of the emperors' becoming Christians to the time of Charles the Great, which contains about five hundred years: for so soon as the emperors became Christian, the church (which before was kept under by persecutions) began to be put in better order. For the calling and authority of bishops over the inferior clergy, that was a thing of known use and benefit for preservation of unity and peace in the church. And so much <sup>t</sup>St. Jerome tells us, though, being none himself, he was no great friend to bishops. And this was so settled in the minds of men from the very infancy of the Christian church, as that it had not been to that time contradicted by any. So that then there was no controversy about the calling; all agreed upon that: the only difficulty was to accommodate the places and precedencies of bishops among themselves, for the very necessity of order and government. To do this, the most equal and impartial way was, that "as the church is in the commonwealth, not the com-

<sup>s</sup> Sect. 25. num. X.

<sup>t</sup> Quod autem postea unus electus est qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam runiperet. Nam et Alexandriae a Marco evangelista presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excellentiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant, &c. S. Hieron. in Epist. ad Evagrium. So, even according to St. Jerome, bishops had a very ancient and honourable descent in the church, from St. Mark the evangelist: and about the end of the

same epistle he acknowledges it; Traditionem esse apostolicam: nay, more than so, he affirms plainly that ubi non est sacerdos, non est ecclesia. S. Hieron. advers. Luciferian. And in that place most manifest it is, that St. Jerome by *sacerdos* means a *bishop*; for he speaks de sacerdote qui potestatem habet ordinandi, which, in St. Jerome's own judgment, no mere priest had, but a bishop only. S. Hieron. Epist. ad Evagrium. So, even with him, no bishop and no church.

Sect. 25. monwealth in it," (as <sup>u</sup>Optatus tells us,) so the honours of the church should <sup>x</sup>follow the honours of the state: and so it was insinuated, if not ordered (as appears) by the canons of the councils of Chalcedon and Antioch. And this was the very fountain of papal greatness, the pope having his residence in the great imperial city. But precedency is one thing, and authority is another: it was thought fit therefore, though (as <sup>y</sup>St. Cyprian speaks) *episcopatus unus est*, the calling of a bishop be one and the same, that yet among bishops there should be a certain subordination and subjection. The empire therefore being cast into several divisions (which they then called diocesses), every diocess contained several provinces, every province several bishoprics: the chief of the diocess (in that larger sense) was called *ἐξάρχος*, and sometimes a *patriarch*; the chief of a province, a *metropolitan*: next, the bishops in their several diocesses (as we now use that word); among these there was effectual subjection respectively, grounded upon canon and positive law, in their several quarters, but over them none at all; all the difference there was but honorary, not authoritative. If the ambition of some particular persons did attempt now and then to break these bounds, it is no marvel; for no calling can sanctify all that have it. And Socrates tells us that in this way the bishops of Alexandria and Rome advanced themselves to a great height, *πέρα τῆς ἱερωσύνης*, even beyond the quality of bishops. Now upon view of story it will appear, that what advantage accrued to Alexandria was gotten by the violence of Theophilus, patriarch there, a man of exceeding great learning, and of no less violence: and he made no little advantage out of this, that the empress Eudoxia used his help for the casting of St. Chrysostom out of Constantinople. But the Roman prelates grew, by a steady and constant watchfulness upon all occasions, to increase the honour of that see, interposing and <sup>z</sup>assuming to themselves to be *vindices canonum* (as St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks), defenders and restorers of the canons of the church; which was a fair pretence, and took extremely well. But yet the world took

<sup>u</sup> Non enim repub. est in ecclesia, sed ecclesia in repub. Optat. lib. iii.

<sup>x</sup> Concil. Chalcedon. can. 9. et act. xvi.

<sup>y</sup> S. Cyprian. lib. de Simp. Prælat.

<sup>z</sup> ὁ ἄσ[θεν] λέγουσι] Ut aiunt, sive se jactant esse. Greg. Nazianz. Carn. de Vita sua, p. 26.



notice of this their aim: for in all contestations betwixt the east and the west, which were nor small nor few, the western bishops objected levity to the eastern, and they again arrogance to the bishops of the west, as <sup>a</sup>Bilius observes, and upon very warrantable testimonies. For all this the bishop of Rome continued in good obedience to the emperor, enduring his censures and judgments: and being chosen by the clergy and people of Rome, he accepted from the emperor the ratification of that choice; insomuch that, about the year 579, when all Italy was on fire with the Lombards, and <sup>b</sup>Pelagius the Second, constrained through the necessity of the times, contrary to the example of his predecessors, to enter upon the popedom without the emperor's leave, St. Gregory, then a deacon, was shortly after sent on embassy to excuse it. About this time brake out the ambition of <sup>c</sup>John, patriarch of Constantinople, affecting to be universal bishop. He was countenanced in this by Mauricius the emperor, but sourly opposed by Pelagius and St. Gregory; insomuch that <sup>d</sup>St. Gregory says plainly, "That this pride of his shews that the times of Antichrist were near." So as yet (and this was now upon the point of six hundred years after Christ) there was no universal bishop, no one monarch over the whole militant church. But Mauricius being deposed and murdered by Phocas, Phocas conferred upon <sup>e</sup>Boniface the Third that

<sup>a</sup> Orientalibus levitas, occidentalibus arrogantia invicem objecta est. Bilius Annot. in S. Greg. Nazianz. Vitam, num. 153.—Quid opus est occidentali supercilio? ex S. Basil, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Hæc una fuit causa quare Pelagius injussu principis pontifex creatus sit, quum extra obsessam ab hoste urbem mitti quispiam non posset, &c. Postea itaque ad placandum imperatorem Gregorius diaconus, &c. Platina in Vita Pelagii II. et Onuph. ibid.

<sup>c</sup> Onuph. in Plat. in Vita Bonif. III.

<sup>d</sup> In hac ejus superbia quid aliud nisi propinqua jam Antichristi esse tempora designatur. S. Greg. lib. iv. epist. 78.

<sup>e</sup> It may be they will say, St. Gregory did not inveigh against the *thing*, but the *person*; that John of Constantinople should take that upon him which belonged to the pope; but it is manifest by St. Gregory's own text, that he speaks against the thing itself, that neither the

bishop of Rome nor any other ought to take on him that title. Cura totius ecclesiæ et principatus S. Petro committitur, et tamen universalis apostolus non vocatur. S. Greg. lib. iv. epist. 76. (Therefore neither is his successor universal bishop.)—Nunquid ego hac in re propriam causam defendo? Nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? Et non magis causam omnipotentis Dei et universalis ecclesiæ? Where he plainly denies that he speaks in his own cause, or in the cause of his see.—Per venerandam Chalcedonensem synodum hoc nomen Rom. pontifici oblatum est, sed nullus eorum unquam hoc singularitatis vocabulum assumpsit, nec uti consensit, ne dum privatum aliquid daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi, &c.; where he plainly says the Roman bishops rejected this title. Ibid. And yet for all this, pope Gregory VII. delivers it as one of his dic-



Sect. 25. very honour which two of his predecessors had declaimed against as <sup>f</sup>monstrous and blasphemous, if not antichristian. Where, by the way, either those two popes, Pelagius and St. Gregory, erred in this weighty business about an universal bishop over the whole church; or if they did not err, Boniface and the rest which after him took it upon them were in their very predecessor's judgment antichristian. But to proceed. <sup>g</sup>As yet the right of election or ratification of the pope continued in the emperor; but then the Lombards grew so great in Italy, and the empire was so infested with Saracens, and such changes happened in all parts of the world, as that neither for the present the homage of the pope was useful to the emperor, nor the protection of the emperor available for the pope. By this means the bishop of Rome was left to play his own game by himself; a thing which, as it pleased him well enough, so both he and his successors made great advantage by it: for being grown to that eminence by the emperor, and the greatness of that city and place of his abode, he found himself the more free, the greater the tempest was that beat upon the other. And then, first, <sup>h</sup>he set himself to alienate the hearts of the Italians from the emperor; next, he opposed himself against him. And about the year seven hundred and ten pope Constantine the First did also first of all openly confront Philippicus the emperor in defence of images, as <sup>i</sup>Onnphrius tells us. After him <sup>k</sup>Gregory the Second and the Third took up his example, and did the like by Leo Isaurus. By this time the Lombards began to pinch very close, and to vex on all sides not Italy

tates, in a council held at Rome about the year 1076, Quod solus Romanus pontifex jure dicatur *universalis*. Baron. Annal. ad an. 1076. num. 31 et 32.

<sup>f</sup> Absit a cordibus Christianorum nomen istud blasphemie. S. Greg. lib. iv. epist. 76.—In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere. Ibid. lib. iv. epist. 83.

<sup>g</sup> Vana tunc habebatur cleri et populi electio, nisi aut imperatores, aut eorum exarchi confirmassent. Plat. in Vita Severini I.

<sup>h</sup> Quum Theophylactus exarchus imperatoris Italiam peteret, milites Itali, veriti ne quid mali ejus adventus por-

tenderet, quod superioribus temporibus fere magis cum pontificibus quam cum imperatoribus sensissent ingressurum Romam interficere constituerant. (And the emperor's own governor was fain to be defended from the emperor's own soldiers by the pope's power, who had gotten interest in them against their own master.) Platina in Vita Johan. VI. Absimarum was then emperor.

<sup>i</sup> Primus omnium Rom. pontificum imperatori Græco Philippico in os resistere palam ausus est. Omph. in Plat. in Vita Constantini I.

<sup>k</sup> Platina in Vita Gregor. II. et III.

only, but Rome too. This drives the pope to seek a new patron; and very fitly he meets with Charles Martel in France, that famous warrior against the Saracens; <sup>l</sup>him he implores in defence of the church against the Lombards. This address seems very advisedly taken, at least it proves very fortunate to them both; <sup>m</sup>for in short time it dissolved the kingdom of the Lombards in Italy, which had then stood two hundred and four years, which was the pope's security, and it brought the crown of France into the house of Charles, and shortly after the western empire. And now began the pope to be great indeed; for by the bounty of <sup>n</sup>Pepin, son of Charles, that which was taken from the Lombards was given to the pope, so that now of a bishop he became a temporal prince. But when Charles the Great had set up the western empire, then he resumed the ancient and original power of the emperor, to govern the church, to call councils, to order papal elections. And this power continued in his posterity; for this right of the emperor was in force and use in Gregory the Seventh's time, <sup>o</sup>who was confirmed in the popedom by Henry the Fourth, whom he afterward deposed: and it might have continued longer, if the succeeding emperors had had abilities enough to secure or vindicate their own right; but the pope, keeping a strong council about him, and meeting with some weak princes, and they oftentimes distracted with great and dangerous wars, grew stronger, till he got the better. So this is enough to shew how the popes climbed up by the emperors till they overtopped them; which is all I said before, and have now proved. And this was about the year 1073; (for the whole popedom of Gregory the Seventh was begun and ended with<sup>n</sup> in the reign of William the Conqueror.) Yet was it carried <sup>n</sup> succeeding times with great changes of fortune and different success; the emperor sometimes plucking from the pope, and the <sup>p</sup>pope from the

<sup>l</sup> Ut laboranti Romæ et ecclesiæ primo quoque tempore auxilium ferret, &c. Platin. in Vita Greg. III.

<sup>m</sup> Quæ res semel incepta cum Longobardici regni excidio finita est. Omph. in Plat. in Vita Constantini Primi.

<sup>n</sup> Redditus itaque Romanis exarchatus est, quicquid Padum et Apenninum interjacet, &c. Plat. in Vita Stephani Secundi.

<sup>o</sup> Imperator in gratiam cum Gregorio rediit, eundemque in pontificatu confirmavit, ut tum imperatorum mos erat. Plat. in Vita Gregor. Septim.

<sup>p</sup> Multi deinde fuerunt imperatores Hen. similiores, quam Jul. Cesari, quos subigere non fuit difficile, dum domi rerum omnium securi, &c. Calv. Instit. lib. iv. c. 11. §. 13.

Sect. 25. emperor, winning and losing ground, as their spirits, abilities, aids, and opportunities were, till at the last the pope settled himself upon the grounds laid by Gregory the Seventh, in the great power which he now uses in and over these parts of the Christian world.

XIII.—Thirdly, A. C. knowing it is not enough to say this, “That the pope is pastor of the whole church,” labours to prove it. And first he tells us that Irenæus intimates so much, but he doth not tell us where; and he is much scanted of ancient proof, if Irenæus stand alone. Besides, Irenæus was a bishop of the Gallican church, and a very unlikely man to captivate the liberty of that church under the more powerful principality of Rome. And how can we have better evidence of his judgment touching that principality than the actions of his life? When pope Victor excommunicated the Asian churches ἀθρόως, <sup>r</sup>all at a blow, was not Irenæus the chief man that reprehended him for it? A very unmeet and undutiful thing sure it had been in Irenæus, in deeds to tax him of rashness and inconsiderateness, whom in words A. C. would have to be acknowledged by him “the supreme and infallible pastor of the universal church.” But the place of Irenæus which A. C. means (I think) is this, where he uses these words indeed, but short of A. C.’s sense of it: “<sup>s</sup>To this church,” he speaks of Rome, “*propter potentiorem principalityatem*, for the more powerful principality of it, it is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful, *undique*, round

A. C. p. 58. about, should have recourse.” “Should have recourse,” so A. C.

<sup>q</sup> For in a synod at Rome about the year 1076, pope Gregory the Seventh established certain brief conclusions, twenty-seven in number, upon which stands almost all the greatness of the papacy. These conclusions are called *dictatus papæ*. And they are reckoned up by Baronius in the year 1076. num. 31, 32, &c. But whether this dictatorship did now first invade the church, I cannot certainly say. The chief of those propositions follow here.—“Quod solus Rom. pontifex jure dicatur *universalis*.” “Quod solius papæ pedes omnes principes deosculentur.” “Quod liceat illi imperatores deponere.” “Quod nulla synodus absque præcepto ejus debet generalis vocari.” “Quod nullum capitulum, nullusque

liber canonicus habeatur absque illius autoritate.” “Quod sententia illius a nullo debet retractari, et ipse omnium solus retractare potest.” “Quod Rom. ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum, scriptura testante, errabit.” “Quod Rom. pontifex, si canonicè fuerit ordinatus, meritis B. Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus.” “Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subditos potest absolvere.”

<sup>r</sup> Euseb. lib. v. c. 25.

<sup>s</sup> Ad hanc ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalityatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, i. e. eos qui sunt undique fideles: in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio. Iren. lib. iii. c. 3.

translates it; and what doth this avail him? Very great Sect. 25.  
 reason was there in Irenæus his time, that upon any difference arising in the faith, *omnes undique fideles*, all the faithful, or if you will, all the churches round about, should have recourse, that is, resort to Rome, being the imperial city; and so a church of more powerful principality than any other at that time in those parts of the world. Well, will this exalt Rome to be the head of the church universal? What if the states and policies of the world be much changed since, and this conveniency of resorting to Rome be quite ceased? then is not Rome divested of her more powerful principality? But the meaning of A. C. is, we must so have recourse to Rome as to submit our faith to hers; and then, not only in Irenæus his time, but through all times reform ourselves by her rule: that is, all the faithful, not *undique*, round about, but *ubique*, every where, must agree with Rome in point of faith. This he means, and Rome may thank him for it; but this Irenæus saith not, nor will his words bear it, nor durst A. C. therefore construe him so, but was content to smooth it over with this ambiguous phrase, “of having recourse to Rome;” yet this is a place as much stood upon by them as any other in all antiquity. And should I grant them their own sense, “That all the faithful every where must agree with Rome,” (which I may give, but can never grant,) yet were not this saying any whit prejudicial to us now. For, first, here is a powerful principality ascribed to the church of Rome; and that no man of learning doubts but the church of Rome had within its own patriarchate and jurisdiction, and that was very large, containing †all the provinces in the diocess of Italy (in the old sense of the word *diocess*); which provinces the lawyers and others term *suburbicarias*. There were ten of them; the three islands, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia; and the other seven upon the firm land of Italy: and this (I take it) is plain in Rufinus; for he living shortly after the Nicene council, as he did, and being of Italy, as he was, he might very well know the bounds of that patriarch’s jurisdiction as it was then practised; †and he says expressly,

† Ed. Brerewood Of the jurisdiction and limits of the patriarchs in the time of the Nicene council, ad. Qu. 1. M.S.

‡ Apud Alexandriam, ut in urbe Roma, vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut ille Ægypti, ut hic suburbicariarum

Sect. 25. "That, according to the old custom, the Roman patriarch's charge was confined within the limits of the suburbicarian churches." To avoid the force of this testimony, <sup>x</sup>cardinal Perron lays load upon Rufinus; for he charges him with passion, ignorance, and rashness: and one piece of his ignorance is, that he hath ill translated the canon of the council of Nice. Now be that as it may, I neither do nor can approve his translation of that canon; nor can it be easily proved that he purposely intended a translation: all that I urge is, that Rufinus, living in that time and place, was very like well to know and understand the limits and bounds of that patriarchate of Rome in which he lived. Secondly, here is, That it had *potentioorem*, a more powerful principality than other churches had. And that the protestants grant too; and that not only because the Roman prelate was *ordine primus*, first in order and degree, which some one must be to avoid confusion; <sup>y</sup>but also because the Roman see had won a great deal of credit, and gained a great deal of power to itself in church affairs: because while the Greek, yea, and the African churches too, were turbulent and distracted with many and dangerous opinions, the church of Rome all that while, and a good while after Irenæus too, was more calm and constant to the truth." Thirdly, here is a necessity (say they) required, that every church, that is, the faithful which are every where, agree with that church. But what! simply with that church whatever it do or believe? No, nothing less: for Irenæus adds, "with that church *in qua*, in which is conserved that tradition which was delivered by the apostles." And God forbid but it should be necessary for all churches and all the faithful to agree with that ancient apostolic church in all those things in which it keeps to the doctrine and discipline delivered by the apostles. In Irenæus his time it kept these better than any other church, and by this in part obtained *potentioorem principalityatem*, a greater power than other churches, but not over all other churches. And (as they understand Irenæus) a necessity lay upon all

ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat. Rufin. Eccles. Hist. lib. i. c. 6.

<sup>x</sup> Perron's Reply, lib. ii. c. 6.

<sup>y</sup> Quia cum orientales et Græcæ ecclesie, et Africanæ etiam, multis inter

se opinionum dissensionibus tumultuantur, hæc sedatior aliis, et minus turbulenta fuerit. Calvin. Instit. lib. iv. c. 6. §. 16.



other churches to agree with this ; but this necessity was laid Sect. 25. upon them by the “ then integrity of the Christian faith there professed, not by the universality of the Roman jurisdiction now challenged.” And let Rome reduce itself to the observation of tradition apostolic, to which it then held, and I will say as Irenæus did, “ That it will be then necessary for every church and for the faithful every where to agree with it.” Lastly, let me observe too, that Irenæus made no doubt but that Rome might fall away from apostolical tradition, as well as other particular churches of great name have done. For he does not say *in qua servanda semper erit, sed in qua servata est* ; not, in which church the doctrine delivered from the apostles shall ever be entirely kept, that had been home indeed ; but in which, by God’s grace and merey, it was to that time of Irenæus so kept and preserved. So we have here, in Irenæus his judgment, the church of Rome then entire, but not infallible ; and endowed with a more powerful principality than other churches, but not with an universal dominion over all other churches, which is the thing in question.

XIV.—But to this place of Irenæus A. C. joins a reason A. C. p. 58. of his own ; for he tells us the bishop of Rome is St. Peter’s successor, and therefore to him we must have recourse. The Fathers I deny not ascribe very much to St. Peter, but it is to St. Peter in his own person ; and among them Epiphanius is as free and as frequent in extolling St. Peter as any of them, and yet did he never intend to give an absolute principality to Rome in St. Peter’s right. There is a noted place in that Father, where his words are these : “ <sup>z</sup>For the Lord himself made St. Peter the first of the apostles a firm rock, upon which the church of God is built, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, &c. For in him the faith is made firm every way who received the key of heaven, &c. : for in him all the questions and subtilties of the faith are found.” This is a great place at first sight too, and deserves a marginal note to call young readers’ eyes to view it. And it hath

<sup>z</sup> Ipse autem Dominus constituit eum primum apostolorum, petram firmam super quam ecclesia Dei ædificata est, et portæ inferorum non valebunt adversus illam, &c. Juxta omnem enim modum in ipso firmata est fides, qui

accepit clavem cælorum, &c. In hoc enim omnes questiones ac subtilitates fidei inveniuntur. Epiphanius in Anconato, edit. Paris. Lat. 1564. fol. 497. A. edit. vero Græco-Latin. tom. ii. p. 14.



Sect. 25. this note in the old Latin edition at Paris, 1564: *Petri principatus, et præstantia*, Peter's principality and excellency. This place, as much show as it makes for the Roman principality, I shall easily clear, and yet do no wrong, either to St. Peter or the Roman church. For most manifest it is, that the authority of St. Peter is <sup>a</sup>urged here to prove the Godhead of the Holy Ghost: and then follow the elogies given to St. Peter, the better to set off and make good that authority; as that he was <sup>b</sup>*princeps apostolorum*, the prince of the apostles, "and pronounced blessed by Christ; because, as God the Father revealed to him the Godhead of the Son, so did he again the Godhead of the Holy Ghost." After this Epiphanius calls him <sup>c</sup>*solidam petram*, a solid rock, upon which the church of God was founded, against which the gates of hell should not prevail: and adds, "That the faith was rooted and made firm in him <sup>d</sup>every way, in him who received the key of heaven." And after this he gives the reason of all; "<sup>e</sup>because in him," mark, I pray, it is still *in him* as he was blessed by that revelation from God the Father, <sup>f</sup>St. Matthew xvi., "were found all the *λεπτολογήματα*, the very niceties and exactness of the Christian faith." For he professed the Godhead of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and so *omni modo*, every point of faith was rooted in him; and this is the full meaning of that learned Father in this passage. Now therefore, building the church upon St. Peter, in Epiphanius his sense, is not as if he and his successors were to be monarchs over it for ever; but it is the edifying and establishing the church in the true faith of Christ by the confession which St. Peter made. And so he expresses himself elsewhere most plainly <sup>g</sup>; "St. Peter," saith he, "who was made to us indeed a solid rock firming the faith of our Lord. On which (rock) the church is built *juxta omnem modum*, every way. First, that he confessed Christ to be the

<sup>a</sup> Τὸ ὅτι ἐπέφρασεν. For there begins the argument of Epiphanius.

<sup>b</sup> Ὁ κορυφαϊότατος.

<sup>c</sup> Τὴν στερεάν πέτραν.

<sup>d</sup> Κατὰ πάντα γὰρ, &c.

<sup>e</sup> Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Matt. xvi. 17.

<sup>g</sup> Ὁς γέγονεν, &c. Qui factus est nobis revera solida petra firmans fidem

Domini. In qua (petra) ædificata est ecclesia juxta omnem modum. Primo, quod confessus est Christum esse Filium Dei vivi, et statim audit, *Super hanc petram solidæ fidei ædificabo ecclesiam meam*—Etiam de Spiritu Sancto idem, &c. Epiphani. Hæres. lib. ii. 59. contra Catharos, tom. i. p. 500. edit. Græco-Lat.

Son of the living God, and by and by he heard, *Upon this* Sect. 25.  
*rock of solid faith I will build my church*: and the same confession he made of the Holy Ghost." Thus was St. Peter a solid rock upon which the church was founded *omni modo*, every way; that is, the faith of the church was <sup>h</sup>confirmed by him in every point. But that St. Peter was any rock or foundation of the church, so as that he and his successors must be relied on in all matters of faith, and govern the church like princes or monarchs, that Epiphanius never thought of. And that he never did think so, I prove it thus: for, beside this apparent meaning of his context, (as is here expressed,) how could he possibly think of a supremacy due to St. Peter's successor, that in most express terms, and that <sup>i</sup>twice repeated, makes St. James the brother of our Lord, and not St. Peter, succeed our Lord in the principality of the church? And Epiphanius was too full both of learning and industry to speak contrary to himself in a point of this moment.

XV.—Next, since A. C. speeds no better with Irenæus, he A. C. p. 58.  
 will have it out of scripture. And he still tells us the bishop of Rome is St. Peter's successor. Well; suppose that. What then? What! why then he succeeded in all St. Peter's <sup>k</sup>prerogatives which are ordinary and belonged to him as a bishop, though not in the extraordinary which belonged to him as an apostle; for that is it which you all say<sup>l</sup>, but no man proves. If this be so, yet then I must tell A. C., St. Peter in his ordinary power was never made pastor of the whole church: nay, in his extraordinary he had no <sup>m</sup>more powerful principality than the other apostles had. A <sup>n</sup>primacy of order was never denied him by the protestants; and an universal supremacy of power was never granted him by the primitive Christians. Yea, but Christ promised the keys to

<sup>h</sup> Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁ αὐτὸς ἀσφαλίζεται ἡμᾶς. Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Ille primus (speaking of St. James the Lord's brother) episcopalem cathedram cepit, quum ei ante ceteros omnes suum in terris thronum Dominus tradidisset. Epiphanius. Hæres. lib. iii. 78. tom. ii. p. 1039.—Et fere similiter, tom. i. lib. i. Hæres. 29.

<sup>k</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. i. c. 9.

§. Respondeo pontificatum.

<sup>l</sup> Sect. 25. num. X.

<sup>m</sup> Bellarm. ibid.

<sup>n</sup> The Fathers gave three prerogatives to St. Peter—of authority, of primacy, and of principality, but not of supremacy of power. Raynold contra Hart. cap. 5. divis. 3. And he proves it at large.

Sect. 25. St. Peter. ° True ; but so did he to Pall the rest of the apostles, and to their successors as much as to his. So it is *tibi et illis*, not *tibi non illis*, I give the keys to thee and them, not to thee to exclude them ; unless any man will think heaven-gates so easy that they might open and shut them without the keys. And ° St. Augustine is plain ; “ If this were said only to St. Peter, then the church hath no power to do it ;” which God forbid ! The keys therefore were given to St. Peter and the rest in a figure of the church, to whose power and for whose use they were given. But there is not one key in all that bunch that can let in St. Peter’s successor to a more powerful principality universal than the successors of the other apostles had.

A. C. p. 58. XVI.—Yea, but Christ prayed that St. Peter’s faith might not fail<sup>r</sup>. That is true ; and in that sense that Christ prayed St. Peter’s faith failed not ; that is, in application to his person “ for his perseverance in the faith,” as ° St. Prosper applies it ; “ which perseverance yet he must owe and acknowledge to the grace of Christ’s prayer for him, not to the power and ability of his own freewill,” as † St. Jerome tells us. † Bellarmine likes not this, “ because,” saith he, “ Christ here obtained some special privilege for St. Peter ; whereas perseverance in grace is a gift common to all the elect :” and he is so far right. And the special grace which this prayer of Christ obtained for St. Peter was, that he should not fall into a final apostasy ; no, not when Satan had sifted him to the bran, that he fell most horribly even into a threefold denial of his Master, and that with a curse. And to recover this and persevere was *aliquid speciale*, I trow, if any thing ever were. But this will not down with Bellarmine ; no, the <sup>x</sup>*aliquid speciale*, the special thing here obtained, was,

° Matt. xvi. 18.

p Matt. xviii. 18, John xx. 22.

q Si hoc Petro tantum dictum est, non facit hoc ecclesia, &c. S. August. Tract. 50. in S. Joh.

r Luke xxii. 32.

s Denm dare ut in fide perseveretur. S. Prosper. de Vocat. Gent. lib. i. cap. 24.

t Rogavi ut non deficeret, &c. Et certe juxta vos in apostoli erat positum

potestate si voluisset, ut non deficeret fides ejus, &c. S. Hieron. adversus Pelagianos, lib. ii.

u Aliquid speciale. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. cap. 3. §. Secundo, quia sine.

x Ut nec ipse ut pontifex doceret nunquam aliquid contra fidem, sive ut in sede ejus inveniretur qui doceret. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3. §. Alterum privilegium est.

saith he, “ that neither St. Peter himself, nor any other that Sect. 25. should sit in his seat, should teach any thing contrary to the true faith.” That St. Peter after his recovery should preach nothing either as apostle or bishop contrary to the faith, will easily be granted him ; but that none of his successors should do it, but be all infallible, that certainly never came within the compass of *Rogavi pro te, Petre*, I have prayed for thee, Peter. And Bellarmine’s proof of this is his just confutation ; for he proves this exposition of that text only by the testimony of seven popes in their own cause, and then takes a leap to Theophylact, who says nothing to the purpose. So that upon the matter Bellarmine confesses there is not one Father of the church disinterested in the cause that understands this text as Bellarmine doth, till you come down to Theophylact. So the pope’s infallibility appeared to nobody but the popes themselves for above a thousand years after Christ ; for so long it was before <sup>y</sup>Theophylact lived : and the spite of it is, Theophylact could not see it neither, for the most that Bellarmine makes him say is but this : “ <sup>z</sup>Because I account thee as chief of my disciples, confirm the rest ; for this becomes thee, which art to be a rock and foundation of the church after me.” For this is personal too, and of St. Peter, and that as he was an apostle : for otherwise than as an apostle, he was not a rock or foundation of the church ; no, not in a secondary sense. The special privilege therefore which Christ prayed for was personal to St. Peter, and is that which before I mentioned. And Bellarmine himself says, “ That Christ <sup>a</sup>obtained by this prayer two privileges, especial ones for St. Peter : the one, that he should never quite fall from the true faith, how strongly soever he were tempted ; the other, that there should never be found any sitting in his seat that should teach against it.” Now for the first of these, <sup>b</sup>Bellarmino doubts it did not flow over to his successors. Why then, it is true which I here say, that this was

<sup>y</sup> Theophylactus floruit circa anno Dom. 1072.

<sup>z</sup> Quia te habeo principem discipulorum, confirma ceteros. Hoc enim decet te, qui post me ecclesie petra es et fundamentum. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3. §. Præter hos. Ex Theophyl. in 21. S. Luc.

<sup>a</sup> Impetravit, et ibid. §. Est igitur tertia.

<sup>b</sup> Ex quibus privilegiis primum fortasse non manavit ad posteros, at secundum sine dubio manavit ad posteros sive successores. Bellarm. ibid. §. Alterum privilegium.

Sect. 25. personal to St. Peter. But the second, he says, “out of all doubt, passed over to his successors.” Nay, that is not out of all doubt neither. First, because many learned men have challenged many popes for teaching heresy, and that is against the true faith: and that which so many learned men have affirmed is not out of all doubt; or if it be, why does Bellarmine take so much pains to confute and disprove them as <sup>c</sup>he doth? Secondly, because Christ obtained of his Father every thing that he prayed for, if he prayed for it absolutely, and not under a condition: <sup>d</sup>*Father, I know thou hearest me always.* Now Christ here prayed absolutely for St. Peter, therefore whatsoever he asked for him was granted. Therefore, if Christ intended his successors as well as himself, his prayer was granted for his successors as well as for himself. But then, if Bellarmine will tell us absolutely, as he doth, “<sup>e</sup>That the whole gift obtained by this prayer for St. Peter did belong to his successors,” and then by and by after break this gift into two parts, and call the first part into doubt whether it belongs to his successors or no, he cannot say the second part is out of all doubt; for if there be reason of doubting the one, there is as much reason of doubting the other, since they stand both on the same foot, the validity of Christ’s prayer for St. Peter.

XVII.—Yea, but Christ charged St. Peter to govern and feed his whole flock, St. John xxi. Nay, soft, it is but his <sup>f</sup>*sheep* and his *lambs*, and that every apostle and every apostle’s successor hath <sup>g</sup>charge to do, St. Matt. xxviii.; but over the whole flock I find no one apostle or successor set. And  
A. C. p. 58. it is a poor shift to say, as A. C. doth, “That the bishop of Rome is set over the whole flock, because both over lambs and sheep;” for in every flock that is not of barren wethers there are lambs and sheep, that is, <sup>h</sup>weaker and stronger

<sup>c</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. cap. 8.

<sup>d</sup> John xi. 42.

<sup>e</sup> Donum hoc loco Petro impetratum, etiam ad successores pertinet. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. cap. 3. §. Quarto, donum hoc.

<sup>f</sup> John xxi. 15, 16.

<sup>g</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19; and x. 16. the same power and charge is given to them all.

<sup>h</sup> And this seems to me to allude to that of St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 2. and Heb. v. 12, *some are fed with milk, and some with stronger meat*; the lambs with milk, and the sheep with stronger meat. But here A. C. follows pope Hildebrand close, who in the case of the emperor then asked this question: Quando Christus ecclesiam suam Petro commisit, et dixit, *Pasce oves meas*, exceptitne reges? Platin. in Vita Greg. VII. And certainly



Christians; not people and pastors, subjects and governors, Sect. 25. as A. C. expounds it, to bring the necks of princes under Roman pride: and if kings be meant, yet then the command is *pasce*, feed them; but *deponere* or *occidere*, to depose or kill them, is not *pascere* in any sense; *lanii id est, non pastoris*, that is the butcher's, not the shepherd's part: if a sheep go astray never so far, it is not the shepherd's part to kill him; at least if he do, *non pascit dum occidit*, he doth not certainly feed while he kills.

XVIII.—And for the close, “That the bishop of Rome A. C. p. 58. shall never refuse to feed and govern the whole flock in such sort, as that neither particular man nor church shall have just cause, under pretence of reformation in manners or faith, to make a separation from the whole church;” by A. C.'s favour, this is mere begging of the question. He says the pope shall ever govern the whole church so as that there shall be no just cause given of a separation. And that is the very thing which the protestants charge upon him, namely, that he hath governed, if not the whole, yet so much of the church as he hath been able to bring under his power, so as that he hath given too just cause of the present continued separation. And as the corruptions in the doctrine of faith in the church of Rome were the cause of the first separation, so are they at this present day the cause why this separation continues. And further, I for my part am clear of opinion, that the errors in the doctrine of faith which are charged upon the whole church, at least so much of the whole as in these parts of Europe hath been kept under the Roman jurisdiction, have had their original and continuance from this, that so much of the universal church (which indeed they account all) hath forgotten her own liberty, and submitted to the Roman church and bishop, and so is in a manner forced to embrace all the corruptions which the particular church of Rome hath contracted upon itself; and being now not able to free herself from the Roman jurisdiction, is made to continue also in all her corruptions. And for the protestants, they have made no separation from the general church, properly so called, (for therein A. C. said well, the pope's A. C. p. 58.

kings are not exempted from being fed of their kingdoms by any churchmen, by the church, but from being spoiled that they are.

Sect. 25, 26. administration can give no cause to separate from that;) but their separation is only from the church of Rome, and such other churches as by adhering to her have hazarded themselves, and do now miscall themselves the whole catholic church: nay, even here the protestants have not left the church of Rome in her essence, but in her errors, not in the things which constitute a church, but only in such abuses and corruptions as work toward the dissolution of a church.

¶. I also asked who ought to judge in this case: the B. said, a general council.

Sect. 26. B. I.—And surely what greater or surer judgment you can have, where sense of scripture is doubted, than a general  
A. C. p. 59. council, I do not see, nor do you doubt. And A. C. grants it to be “a most competent judge of all controversies of faith, so that all pastors be gathered together, and in the name of Christ, and pray unanimously for the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, and make great and diligent search and examination of the scriptures and other grounds of faith, and then decree what is to be held for divine truth; for then,” saith he, “it is firm and infallible, or else there is nothing firm upon earth.” As fair as this passage seems, and as freely as I have granted that a general council is the best judge on earth, where the sense of scripture is doubted, yet even in this passage there are some things considerable. As, first, when shall the church hope for such a general council, in which all pastors shall be gathered together? There was never any such general council yet, nor do I believe such can be had; so that is supposed in vain; and you might have learned this of <sup>i</sup>Bellarmino, if you will not believe me. Next, saith he, “If all these pastors pray unanimously for the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost.” Why, but if all pastors cannot meet together, all cannot pray together, nor all search the scriptures together, nor all upon that search decree together: so that is supposed in vain too. Yea but, thirdly, “If all that meet do pray unanimously”—What then? all that meet are not simply all; nor doth the Holy Ghost come and give his assistance upon every prayer that is made

<sup>i</sup> Si omnes, nullum fuit hactenus tur deinceps futurum. Bellarm. 1. de concilium generale, neque etiam vide- Concil. cap. 17. §. 1.

unanimously, though by very many prelates or other faithful people met together, unless all other requisites, as well as unanimity, to make their prayer to be heard and granted, be observed by them: so that an unanimous prayer is not adequately supposed, and therefore concludes not. But, lastly, how far a general council, if all A. C.'s conditions be observed, is firm and infallible, that shall be more fully discussed *lat* after. In the mean time, these two words *firm* and *infallible* are ill put together as synonymas: for there are some things most infallible in themselves, which yet could never get to be made firm among men; and there are many things made firm by law, both in churches and kingdoms, which yet are not infallible in themselves: so to draw all together, to settle controversies in the church, here is a visible judge and infallible, but not living, and that is the <sup>k</sup>scripture

j Sect. 33. consid. 1.

k And this was thought a sufficient judge too, when Christians were as humble as learned. I am sure Optatus thought so. *Quærendi sunt iudices. Si Christiani de utraque parte dari non possunt, quia studiis veritas impeditur. De foris quærendus est iudex. Si paganus, non potest nosse Christiana secreta. Si Judæus, inimicus est Christiani baptismatis. Ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri iudicium. De cælo quærendus est iudex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad cælum quum habemus hic evangelio? Testamentum (inquam, quia hoc loco recte possunt terrena cælestibus comparari) tale est, quod quivis hominum habens numerosos filios, his quamdiu pater præsens est, ipse imperat singulis; non est adhuc necessarium testamentum; sic et Christus præsens in terris fuit, (quanvis nec modo desit) pro tempore quicquid necessarium erat, apostolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater dum se in confinio senserit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam, rupta pace litigent fratres, adhibitis testibus voluntatem suam de pectore morituro, transfert in tabulas diu duraturas. Et si fuerit inter fratres contentio nata, non itur ad tumulum, sed queritur testamentum; et qui tumulo quiescit, tacitus de tabulis loquitur. Vivus, ejus est testamentum, in cælo est. Ergo voluntas ejus, velut in testamento, sic in evangelio inquiratur. Optat. adv. Parm. lib. v.*

This pregnant place of Optatus, "That

the scripture is the judge of divine truth whenever it is questioned," though Baldwin dare not deny, yet he would fain slide both by it, and by a parallel place as full in S. August. in Psal. xxi. expositione 2, with this shift, that St. Augustine in another place had rather use the testimony of tradition, that is, the testimony *nuncupativi potius quam scripti testamenti*, of the *nuncupative* rather than the *written* will of Christ. Baldwin. in Optat. lib. v. But this is a mere shift. First, because it is *petitio principii*, the mere begging of the question; for we deny any testament of Christ but that which is written: and A. C. cannot shew it in any one Father of the church that Christ ever left behind him a nuncupative obligatory will. Secondly, because nothing is more plain in these two Fathers, Optatus and St. Augustine, than that both of them appeal to the *written* will, and make that the judge without any exception, when a matter of faith comes in question. In Optatus the words are, *Habemus in evangelio*, we have it in the gospel; and, *In evangelio inquiratur*, let it be inquired in the gospel; and Christ put it in tabulas diu duraturas, into written and lasting instruments. In St. Augustine the words are, "Our Father did not die intestate," &c.; and, *Tabulæ aperiantur*, let his written instruments be opened; and, *Legantur verba mortui*, let the words of him that died be read: and again, *Aperi, legamus*, open the will, and let us read; and, *Legam*

Sect. 26. pronouncing by the church; and there is a visible and a living judge, but not infallible, and that is a general council, lawfully called and so proceeding. But I know no formal confirmation of it needful, (though A. C. <sup>1</sup>require it,) but only that after it is ended the whole church admit it, be it never so tacitly.

A. C. p. 59,  
60.

II.—In the next place, A. C. interposes new matter quite out of the conference. And first, in case of distraction and disunion in the church, he would know what is to be done to reunite, when a general council (which is acknowledged to be a fit judge) cannot be had by reason of manifold impediments, or if being called, will not be of one mind. “Hath Christ our Lord,” saith he, “in this case provided no rule, no judge, infallibly to determine controversies, and to procure unity and certainty of belief? Indeed the protestants admit no infallible means, rule, or judge, but only scripture, which every man may interpret as he pleaseth, and so all shall be uncertain.” Truly, I must confess, there are many impediments to hinder the calling of a general council. You know in the ancient church there was <sup>m</sup>hinderance enough, and what hurt it wrought; and afterward, though it were long first, there was provision made for <sup>n</sup>frequent calling of coun-

mus, quid litigamus? why do we strive? let us read the will: and again, *Aperi testamentum, lege, open the will, read.* All which passages are most express and full for his *written* will, and not for any *nuncupative* will, as Baldwin would put upon us. And Hart, who takes the same way with Baldwin, is not able to make it out, as appears by Dr. Reynolds, in his Conference with Hart, c. 8. divis. 1. p. 396, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Sect. 28. num. I. And so plainly St. Augustine, speaking of St. Cyprian's error about rebaptization, &c., says, *Illis temporibus antequam pleuarii concilii sententia quid in hac re sequendum esset, totius ecclesie consensio confirmasset, Visum est ei cum, &c.* De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 18. So here is first “sententia concilii;” and then the confirmation of it is “totius ecclesie consensio,” the consent of the whole church yielding unto it. And so Gerson, *Concurrente universali totius ecclesie consensu, &c.* In declaratione veritatem quæ credendæ sunt, &c. §. 4. For this, That the pope must confirm it, or

else the general council is invalid, is one of the Roman novelties; for this cannot be shewed in any antiquity void of just exception. The truth is, the pope, as other patriarchs and great bishops used to do, did give his assent to such councils as he approved; but that is no corroboration of the council, as if it were invalid without it, but a declaration of his consenting with the rest. Sect. 33. consid. 4. num. VI.

<sup>m</sup> *Christianitas in diversas hæreses scissa est, quia non erat licentia episcopis in unum convenire, persecutione sæviente usque ad tempora Constantini, &c.* Isidor. Præfat. in Concil. ed. Venet. 1585.

<sup>n</sup> *Frequens generalium conciliorum celebratio est præcipua cultura agri Domini, &c.* Et illorum neglectus errores, hæreses, et schismata disseminat. Hæc præteritorum temporum recordatio et præsentium consideratio ante oculos nostros ponunt. Itaque sancimus, ut a modo concilia generalia celebrentur; ita quod primum a fine hujus concilii in quinquennium immediate sequens,

cils, and yet no age since saw them called according to that Sect. 26. provision in every circumstance: therefore impediments there were enough, or else some declined them wilfully, though there were no impediments. Nor will I deny but that when they were called, there were as many °practices to disturb or pervert the councils; and these practices were able to keep many councils from being all of one mind: but if being called they will not be of one mind, I cannot help that; though that very not agreeing is a shrewd sign that the other spirit hath a party there against the Holy Ghost.

III.—Now A. C. would know what is to be done for reuniting of a church divided in doctrine of the faith, when this remedy by a general council cannot be had: “Sure Christ our Lord,” saith he, “hath provided some rule, some judge, in such and such like cases, to procure unity and certainty of belief.” I believe so too; for he hath left an infallible rule, the scripture; and that, by the manifest places in it (which need no dispute, no external judge), is pable to settle unity and certainty of belief in necessaries to salvation: and in *non necessariis*, in and about things not necessary, there ought not to be a contention to a 9separation.

IV.—And therefore A. C. does not well to make that a crime, that the protestants admit no infallible rule but the scripture only, or, as he (I doubt, not without some scorn) terms it, beside only scripture; for what need is there of another, since this is most infallible, and the same which the rancient church of Christ admitted? And if it were suffieient

secundum vero a fine illius in septennium, et deinceps de decennio in decennium perpetuo celebrentur, &c. Concil. Constant. Sess. 39.—Et apud Gerson. Tom. p. 230. et Pet. de Aliaco Card. Cameracensis libellum obtulit in Concil. Constant. de reformatione ecclesie contra opinionem eorum qui putarunt concilia generalia minus necessaria esse, quia omnia bene a patribus nostris ordinata sunt, &c. In fascie. Rerum expetendarum, fol. 28. Et schismatibus debet ecclesia cito per concilia generalia provideri, ut in primitiva ecclesia docuerunt apostoli, ut Act. vi. et Act. xv. Ibid. fol. 204. A.

o In concil. Ariminensi multis paucorum fraude deceptis, &c. S. August. contra Maximinum, lib. iii. c. 14.

p Non per difficiles nos Deus ad beatam vitam questiones vocat, &c. In absoluto nobis et facili est aternitas; Jesum suscitatum a mortuis per Deum credere, et ipsum esse Dominum confiteri, &c. S. Hilar. de Trin. lib. x. ad finem.

q Cyprianus et collegæ ipsius credentes hæreticos et schismaticos baptismum non habere, sine baptismo receptis, &c. iis tamen communicare quam separari ab unitate maluerrunt. S. August. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. ii. c. 6.—Et hi non contaminabant Cyprianum. Ibid. fine.

r Recensuit cuncta sanctis scripturis consona. Euseb. Hist. lib. v. c. 20. de Irenæo. Regula principalis de qua Paracletus agnitus. Tert. de Monog.



Sect. 26. for the ancient church, to guide them and direct their councils, why should it be now held insufficient for us, at least till a free general council may be had? And it hath both the conditions which <sup>s</sup>Bellarmino requires to a rule, namely, that it be certain, and that it be known; “for if it be not certain, it is no rule, and if it be not known, it is no rule to us.” Now the <sup>t</sup>Romanists dare not deny but this rule is certain; and that it is sufficiently known in the manifest places of it, and such as are necessary to salvation, none of the ancients did ever deny; so there is an infallible rule.

V.—Nor need there be such fear of a private spirit in these manifest things, which being but read or heard, teach themselves. Indeed, you Romanists had need of some other judge, and he a propitious one, to crush the pope’s more powerful principality out of *Pasce oves, Feed my sheep*. And yet this must be the meaning, (if you will have it,) whether <sup>u</sup>Gideon’s fleece be wet or dry, that is, whether there be dew enough in the text to water that sense or no. But, I pray, when God hath left his church this infallible rule, what warrant have you to seek another? you have shewed us none

c. 2. And this is true, though the author spake it when he was lapsed.—*Ipsas scripturas apprime tenens*. S. Hieron. ad Marcellum advers. Montanum, tom. ii.—*Hoc quia de scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, qua probatur*. S. Hieron. in S. Matth. c. xxiii.

Manifestus est fidei lapsus, et liquidum superbiæ vitium, vel respuere aliquid eorum quæ scriptura habet, vel inducere quicquam quod scriptum non est. S. Basil. Sermon. de Fide, tom. ii. p. 154. edit. Basileæ, 1565.

Contra insurgentes hæreses sæpe pugnavi agraphis, verum non alienis a pia secundum scripturam sententia. Ibid. p. 153.

And before Basil, Tertullian: Adoro scripturæ plenitudinem, &c. si non est scriptum, timeat Hermogenes. Væ illud adjucentibus vel detrahentibus destinatum. Tertull. adv. Hermog. c. 22.

And Paulinus plainly calls it “regulam directionis,” epist. 23.

De hac regula tria observanda sunt.  
1. Regula est, sed a tempore quo scripta.  
2. Regula est, sed per ecclesiam applicanda, non per privatum spiritum.  
3. Regula est, et mensurat omnia quæ

continet: continet autem omnia necessaria ad salutem, vel mediate vel immediate. Et hoc tertium habet Biel. in 3. D. 25. q. unica. Conclus. 4. M. And this is all we say. Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. v. §. 22.

<sup>s</sup> Regula catholicæ fidei debet esse certa et nota. Si certa non sit, non erit regula. Si nota non sit, non erit regula nobis. Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, lib. i. c. 2. §. 5.—Sed nihil est vel certius vel notius sacra scriptura. Bellarm. ibid. §. 6.—Therefore the holy scripture is the rule of catholic faith, both in itself and to us also; for in things simply necessary to salvation it is abundantly known and manifest; as §. 16. num. V.

<sup>t</sup> Convenit inter nos et omnes omnino hæreticos, verbum Dei esse regulam fidei, ex qua de dogmatibus judicandum sit. Bellarm. Præfat. tom. i. fine. And although there, perhaps, he includes traditions, yet that was never proved yet: neither indeed can he include traditions; for he speaks of that word of God upon which all heretics consent: but concerning traditions, they all consent not that they are a rule of faith; therefore he speaks not of them.

<sup>u</sup> Judg. vi.

yet, whatever you think you have. And I hope A. C. cannot think it follows, that Christ our Lord hath provided no rule to determine necessary controversies, because he hath not provided the rule which he would have. Sect. 26.

VI.—Besides, let there be such a living judge as A. C. would have, and let the <sup>x</sup>pope be he, yet that is not sufficient, against the malice of the devil and impious men, to keep the church at all times from renting, even in the doctrine of faith, or to solder the rents which are made; for *oportet esse hæreses*, heresies there will be, and heresies properly there cannot be but in doctrine of the faith. And what will A. C. in this case do? Will he send Christ our Lord to provide another rule than the decision of the bishop of Rome, because he can neither make unity nor certainty of belief? And (as it is most apparent) he cannot do it *de facto*, so neither hath he power from Christ over the whole church to do it; nay, out of all doubt, it is not the least reason why *de facto* he hath so little success, because *de jure* he hath no power given. But since A. C. requires another judge besides the scripture, and in cases when either the time is so difficult that a general council cannot be called, or the council so set that they will not agree, let us see how he proves it.

VII.—It is thus: “Every earthly kingdom,” saith he, A. C. p. 60. “when matters cannot be composed by a parliament, (which cannot be called upon all occasions”—why doth he not add here, ‘and which being called will not always be of one mind,’ as he did add it in case of the council?) “hath, besides the law-books, some living magistrates and judges, and, above all, one visible king, the highest judge, who hath authority sufficient to end all controversies, and settle unity in all temporal affairs. And shall we think that Christ, the wisest King, hath provided in his kingdom the church, only the law-books of the holy scripture, and no living visible judges, and above all, one chief, so assisted by his Spirit as may suffice to end all controversies for unity and certainty of faith? which can never be, if every man may interpret holy scripture, the law-books, as he list.” This is a very plausible argument with the many; but the foundation of it is but a

<sup>x</sup> For so he affirms, p. 58.

Y 1 Cor. xi. 19.

Sect. 26. <sup>z</sup>similitude; and if the similitude hold not in the main, the argument is nothing; and so I doubt it will prove here. I will observe particulars as they lie in order.

VIII.—And first, he will have the whole militant church (for of that we speak) a kingdom. But this is not certain; for they are no mean ones which think our Saviour Christ left the church militant in the hands of the apostles and their successors in an aristocratical, or rather a mixed government; and that the church is not <sup>a</sup>monarchical otherwise than the triumphant and militant make one body under Christ the head. And in this sense indeed, and in this only, the church is a most absolute kingdom; and the very expressing of this sense is a full answer to all the places of scripture and other arguments brought by <sup>b</sup>Bellarmino to prove that the church is a monarchy. But the church being as large as the world, Christ thought it fitter to govern it aristocratically by divers, rather than by one viceroy. And I believe this is true: for all the time of the first three hundred years and somewhat better, it was governed aristocratically, if we will impartially consider how the bishops of those times carried the whole business of admitting any new consecrated bishops or others to, or rejecting them from their communion. For I have carefully examined this for the first six hundred years, even to and within the time of St. Gregory the Great, <sup>c</sup>who in

<sup>z</sup> Quæ subtilissime de hoc disputari possunt, ita ut non similitudinibus quæ plerumque fallunt sed rebus ipsis satisfiat, &c. S. August. lib. de Quant. Animæ, cap. 32. Whereupon the logicians tell us rightly, that this is a fallacy, unless it be taken *reduplicative*, i. e. de similibus quæ similia sunt. And hence Aristotle himself, 2 Top. Loc. 32, says, *πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, εἰ ὁμοίως ἔχει*. Rursum in similibus, si similiter se habent.

<sup>a</sup> When Gerson writ his tract De Auferibilitate Papæ, sure he thought the church might continue in a very good being without a monarchical head: therefore in his judgment the church is not by any command or institution of Christ monarchical. Gerson. par. 1. p. 154.

When St. Hierome wrote thus—Ubi-  
cumque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ,  
sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive

Rhegii, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis; ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. S. Hieron. Epist. ad Evagrium—doubtless he thought not of the Roman bishop's monarchy. For what bishop is of the same merit or of the same degree in the priesthood with the pope, as things are now carried at Rome? Affirmamus etiam, Patribus et Græcis et Latinis, ignotas esse voces de Petro aut papa, monarcha et monarchia. Nam quod in superioribus observabamus reperiri eas dictiones positas pro episcopo, et episcopatu, nihil hoc ad rem facit. Isa. Casaub., Exercitatione 15. ad Annales Eccles. Baron. §. 12. p. 378. et §. 11. p. 360, diserte asserit et probat ecclesiæ regimen aristocraticum fuisse.

<sup>b</sup> Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 16. §. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>c</sup> S. Greg. lib. ix. epist. 58. et lib. xii. epist. 15.

the beginning of the seventh hundred year sent such letters Sect. 26. to Augustine then archbishop of Canterbury, and to <sup>d</sup>Quirinus and other bishops in Ireland; and I find that the *literæ communicatorie*, which certified from one great patriarch to another, who were fit or unfit to be admitted to their communion, if they upon any occasion repaired to their sees, were sent mutually, and as freely and in the same manner from Rome to the other patriarchs as from them to it. Out of which, I think, this will follow most directly, That the church government then was aristocratical: for had the bishop of Rome been then accounted sole monarch of the church, and been put into the definition of the church, (as he is now by <sup>e</sup>Bellarmino,) all these communicatory letters should have been directed from him to the rest, as whose admittance ought to be a rule for all to communicate; but not from others to him, or at least not in that even, equal, and brotherly way as now they appear to be written. For it is no way probable that the bishops of Rome, which even then sought their own greatness too much, would have submitted to the other patriarchs voluntarily, had not the very course of the church put it upon them.

IX.—Besides, this is a great and undoubted rule given by <sup>f</sup>Optatus, That wheresoever there is a church, there the “church is in the commonwealth, not the commonwealth in the church: and so also the church was in the Roman empire.” Now from this ground I argue thus: If the church be within the empire or other kingdom, it is impossible the government of the church should be monarchial. For no emperor or king will endure another king within his dominion that shall be greater than himself, since the very enduring it makes him that endures it upon the matter no monarch. Nor will it disturb this argument, that two great kings in France and Spain permit this. For he that is not blind may see, if he will, of what little value the pope’s power is in those kingdoms, further than to serve their own turns of him, which they do to their great advantage. Nay further, the ancient canons and Fathers of the church seem to me plain for this; for

<sup>d</sup> S. Greg. lib. ix. epist. 61.

<sup>e</sup> Bellarm. de Eccles. lib. iii. c. 2. §. Nostra autem.

<sup>f</sup> Non enim respublica est in ecclesia: sed ecclesia in republica, i. e. in imperio Romano. Optat. lib. iii.

Sect. 26. the council of Antioch submits ecclesiastical causes to the bishops; and what was done aniss by a bishop was corrigible by a<sup>h</sup> synod of bishops, but this with the<sup>i</sup> metropolitan; and in case these did not agree, the<sup>k</sup> metropolitan might call in other bishops out of the neighbouring provinces; and if things settled not this way, a general council (<sup>l</sup>under the scripture, and directed by it) was the highest remedy. And <sup>m</sup>St. Cyprian, even to pope Cornelius himself, says plainly, “that to every bishop is ascribed a portion of the flock for him to govern;” and so not all committed to one: in all this the government of the church seems plainly aristocratical. And if all other arguments fail, we have one left from Bellarmine, who opposes it as much as any, <sup>n</sup>twice for failing; and yet where he goes to exclude secular princes from church-government, <sup>o</sup>all his quotations and all his proofs run upon this head, to shew that the government of the church was ever in the bishops. What says <sup>p</sup>A. C. now to the confession of this great adversary, and in this great point, extorted from him by force of truth? Now if this be true, then the whole foundation of this argument is gone; the church militant is no kingdom, and therefore not to be compared or judged by one: the resemblance will not hold.

X.—Next, suppose it a kingdom, yet the church militant remaining one is spread in many earthly kingdoms, and cannot well be ordered like any one particular <sup>q</sup>kingdom; and

<sup>g</sup> Concil. Antioch. c. 9. p. 507.

<sup>h</sup> Concil. Nic. 1. c. 5. et Antioch. c. 12.

<sup>i</sup> Concil. Nic. 1. c. 4. et Antioch. Can. 9.

<sup>k</sup> Concil. Antioch. c. 14.

<sup>l</sup> Sed præponitur scriptura. S. August. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. ii. c. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, &c. et singulis pastoribus portio gregis, &c. S. Cypr. lib. i. ep. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. i. c. 8. et de Concil. lib. ii. c. 16.

<sup>o</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. i. c. 7.

<sup>p</sup> A. C. p. 64, 65.

<sup>q</sup> Licet sit expediens quod uni populo partiali fidei præsit unus episcopus; non expedit tamen quod toti populo fidei præsit unus solus. Tum quia omnia negotia unius populi partialis potest sustinere unus solus; nullus autem unus potest sustinere omnia ne-

gotia etiam majora omnium Christianorum. Tum quia minus malum est, ut populus partialis et parvus inficiatur ab uno episcopo, quam ut totus, vel fere totus populus Christianus inficiatur ab uno capite, quod omnibus præsit, Occam. Dial. Tract. 1. lib. ii. p. 3. c. 30. ad 8. And besides this of Occam, to that common argument, that monarchical government is the best, and therefore undoubtedly that which Christ instituted for his church, it is sufficient to answer, That a monarchy is the best form of government in one city or country, Arist. Moral. lib. viii. c. 10; but it follows not that it is the best in respect of the whole world, where the parts are so remote and the dispositions of men so various. And therefore Bellarmine himself confesses, Monarchiam aristocratiae et democratiae admixtam utiliorem esse in hac vita, quam simplex



therefore, though in one particular kingdom there may be Sect. 26.  
many visible judges and one supreme, yet it follows not that  
in the universal militant church there must be one supreme ;  
for how will he enter to execute his office, if the kings of  
those kingdoms will not give leave ?

XI.—Now here, though A. C. expresses himself no further,  
yet I well know what he and his fellows would be at ; they  
would not be troubled to ask leave of any several kings in  
their several dominions. No ; they would have one emperor  
over all the kings, as well as one pope over all the bishops.  
And then you know <sup>r</sup>who told us of two great lights to go-  
vern the world, the sun and the moon, that is, the pope and  
the emperor. At the first it began with more modesty, the  
emperor and the pope ; and that was somewhat tolerable :  
for <sup>s</sup>St. Augustine tells us, “ That the militant church is  
often in scripture called the moon, both for the many changes  
it hath, and for its obscurity in many times of its peregrina-  
tion ;” and he tells us too, that if we will understand this  
place of scripture in a spiritual sense, <sup>t</sup>our Saviour Christ is  
the sun, and the militant church as being full of changes in  
her estate, the moon. But now it must be a triumphant church  
here, militant no longer ; the pope must be the sun, and the  
emperor but the moon : and lest Innocent’s own power should  
not be able to make good his decretal, <sup>u</sup>Gasper Schioppus  
doth not only avow the allusion or interpretation, but is  
pleased to express many circumstances in which he would fain  
make the world believe the resemblance holds. And lest any  
man should not know how much the pope is made greater  
than the emperor by this comparison, the <sup>x</sup>Gloss furnishes  
us with that too, and tells us, that by this it appears, “ that

monarchia est. De Rom. Pont. lib. i.  
c. 3. §. 1.

<sup>r</sup> In the first gloss ascribed to Isidore  
in Gen. i. 16. it is Per solem intelligi-  
tur regnum ; per lunam, sacerdotium.  
But Innocent the Third, almost six  
hundred years after Isidore’s death, per-  
verts both text and gloss, thus : Ad  
firmamentum cœli, i. e. universalis ec-  
clesiæ, fecit Deus duo magna luminaria,  
hoc est, duas instituit potestates, pon-  
tificalem, et regalem, &c. Ut quanta  
inter solem et lunam, tanta inter pon-  
tifices et reges differentia cognoscatur.  
Epist. ad Imperat. Constantinopolita-

num. Decret. de Majoritate et Obe-  
dientia, lib. i. Tit. 33. cap. solita.

<sup>s</sup> Ecclesia militans sæpe in scripturis  
dicitur luna, propter mutabilitatem, &c.  
S. August. Epist. 119. c. 6.

<sup>t</sup> Intelligimus spiritualiter ecclesiam,  
&c. Et hic quis est sol, nisi sol justiti-  
æ ? &c. S. August. in Psal. ciii.

<sup>u</sup> Gasp. Schiop. L. dicto Ecclesiast-  
icus, c. 145.

<sup>x</sup> Igitur cum terra sit septies major  
luna, sol autem octies major terra, re-  
stat ergo ut pontificalis dignitas qua-  
dragesies septies sit major regali dig-  
nitate. Gloss in Decret. prædict. Where

Sect. 26. since the earth is seven times greater than the moon and the sun eight times greater than the earth, it must needs follow that the pope's power is forty-seven times greater than the emperor's:" I like him well, he will make odds enough. But what, doth Innocent the Third give no reason of this his decretal? Yes. And it is, saith he, "ybecause the sun, which rules in the day, that is, in spiritual things, is greater than the moon, which rules but in the night, and in carnal things." But is it possible that Innocentius the Third, being so wise and so able as <sup>z</sup>that "nothing which he did, or commended, or disproved in all his life, should after his death be thought fit to be changed," could think that such an allusion of spiritual things to the day which the sun governs, and worldly business to the night which the moon governs, should carry weight enough with it to depress imperial power lower than God hath made it? Out of doubt he could not; for he well knew that *omnis anima*, every soul was to be subject to the *higher power*<sup>a</sup>, Rom. xiii.; and the *bhigher power* there mentioned is the temporal: and the <sup>c</sup>ancient Fathers come in with a full consent, that *omnis anima*, every soul, comprehends there all without any exception; all spiritual men even to the highest bishop, and in spiritual causes too, so the foundations of faith and good manners be not shaken; and where they are shaken there ought to be prayer and patience,

first the Gloss is out in his Latin. He might have said *quadragies*, for *quadragiesies* is no word. Next, he is out in his arithmetic; for eight times seven makes not forty-seven, but fifty-six: and then he is much to blame for drawing down the pope's power from fifty-six to forty-seven. And lastly, this allusion hath no ground of truth at all: for the emperor being *solo Deo minor* (Tertul. ad Scap.) cannot be a moon to any other sun.

<sup>y</sup> Sed illa potestas, quæ præest diebus, i. e. in spiritualibus, major est; quæ vero carnalibus, minor. Innocent. III. ubi supra.

<sup>z</sup> Ut post ejus mortem, nihil eorum quæ in hac vita egerit, laudaverit, aut improbaverit, immutatum sit. Platina in vita ejus.

<sup>a</sup> Rom. xiii. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Patres veteres, et præcipue August. Epist. 54.—Apostolum interpretantur de potestate seculari tantum loqui, quod

et ipse textus subindicat, &c. Salmeron, Disput. 4. in Rom. xiii. §. Porro per potestatem.

<sup>c</sup> Πᾶσι τὰτα διατάττεται, καὶ ἱερεῦσι, &c. Omnibus ista imperantur, et sacerdotibus et monachis, &c. Et postea: Etiamsi apostolus sis, si evangelista, si propheta, sive quisquis tandem fueris. S. Chrysost. Hom. 23. in Rom.—Sive est sacerdos, sive antistes, &c. Theodoret. in Rom. xiii.—Si omnis anima, et vestra. Quis vos excipit ab universitate? &c. Ipsi sunt qui vobis dicere solent, servate vestræ sedis honorem, &c. Sed Christus aliter et jussit, et gessit, &c. S. Bern. Epist. 42. ad Henricum Senonensem archiepiscopum. Et Theophylact. in Rom. xiii., where it is very observable that Theophylact lived in the time of pope Gregory the Seventh, and St. Bernard after it, and yet this truth obtained then; and this was about the year 1130.

there ought not to be opposition by force. Nay, he knew Sect. 26. well that <sup>d</sup>emperors and kings are *custodes utriusque tabulæ*, they to whom the custody and preservation of both tables of the law for worship to God and duty to man are committed; that a book of the law was by God's own command in Moses his time to be given the king<sup>e</sup>; that the kings under that law, but still according to it, did proceed to necessary reformations in church businesses, and therein commanded the very priests themselves, as appears in the acts of <sup>f</sup>Hezekiah and <sup>g</sup>Josiah, who yet were never censured to this day for usurping the high priest's office. Nay, he knew full well that the greatest emperors for the church's honour, Theodosius the Elder, and Justinian, and Charles the Great, and divers others, did not only meddle now and then, but did enact laws to the great settlement and increase of religion in their several times. But then if this could not be the reason why Innocentius made this strange allusion, what was? Why truly I will tell you. The pope was now grown to a great and a firm height; <sup>h</sup>Gregory the Seventh had set the popedom upon a broad bottom before this Innocent's time: so that now it is the less wonder if he make so bold with the emperor as to depress him as low as the moon, upon no better ground than a groundless resemblance; but beside this prime reason, there are divers other which may easily be drawn out of the same resemblance. For since Innocentius his main aim was to publish the pope's greatness over kings and emperors,

<sup>d</sup> An forte de religione fas non est ut dicat imperator, vel quos miserit imperator? Cur ergo ad imperatorem vestri venire legati? Cur enim fecerunt causæ suæ iudicem, non secuturi quod ille judicaret? &c. S. August. cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. i. c. 9.—Et quæstio fuit, an pertineret ad imperatorem adversus eos aliquid statuere qui prava in religione sectantur. Ibid.—Nor can this be said to be usurpation in the emperor. Nam S. August. alibi sic, Ad imperatoris curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus est, res illa maxime pertinebat. S. August. Epist. 162. et Epist. 50.—Quis mente sobrius regibus dicat, Nolite curare in regno vestro a quo teneatur, vel oppugnetur ecclesia Domini vestri? &c. Antiquitas recte dixit, Magistratus est custos legis, scilicet

primæ et secundæ tabulæ, quod ad disciplinam attinet. Confessio Saxonica, §. 23. et Gerardus, Læcorum tom. vi. c. 6. §. 5. membro 1, probat ex Deut. xvii. 18.

<sup>e</sup> Deut. xvii. 18. <sup>f</sup> 2 Chron. xxix. 4. <sup>g</sup> 4 Reg. xxiii. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Hic maximus pontifex totius ecclesiasticæ libertatis unicus assertor. Ounph. in Plat. in Greg. VII. For taking occasion by the war which Henry the Fourth had with the Saxons and their neighbours, and the complaint of the Saxons made to the pope, (of which Platina in the life of Gregory the Seventh,) the pope, wise enough for his own advantages, sought not only to free himself from the emperor, but to make the emperor subject to him; and for this the history is plain enough.

Sect. 26. why doth he not tell us, that the pope is as the sun, and the emperor as the moon? Because as the moon borrows all her light from the sun, so the emperor borrows all his true light from the pope; or because as the moon still increases in light so long as she follows the sun, but so soon as ever she steps before the sun she wanes presently, and her light decreases; so the emperor, so long as he is content to follow the pope, and do all that he would have him, his light and his power increase; but if he do but offer to step before (though that be his proper place) then his light and honour and power and all decrease. And this pope Gregory the Seventh made too good upon the emperor Henry the Fourth; and pope Adrian the Fourth, and Alexander the Third, and Lucius the Third, with some others, upon Frederick Barbarossa. And some other emperors were alike served where they did not submit; and I hope no man will blame the pope's holiness for this: for if the emperors kept the popes under for divers years together, whereas <sup>i</sup>Bellarmino tells us it was against all right they should do so, the pope being never rightfully subject unto them, I hope the pope having now got power enough may keep the emperors under, and not suffer them any more to step before the sun, lest like moons as they are, they lose all their light: or because as the moon is but *vicaria solis*, the vicar or substitute of the sun, as <sup>k</sup>Philo tells us; so the emperor, at least in all spiritual causes, is but the pope's substitute, and that for the night, that his holiness may sleep the quieter on the other side of the sphere: or lastly (if you will abuse the scripture, as you too often do, and as Innocentius did in the decretal very grossly) you may say, it is because the woman, which all grant represented the church, <sup>l</sup>is clothed with the sun, that is, with the glorious rays of the pope, and had the moon, that is, the <sup>m</sup>emperor,

<sup>i</sup> Papa, utpote regis regum vicarius, nunquam erat de jure subditus imperatoribus terrenis, sed quia tum potestas ejus non erat nota:—et quia viribus temporalibus destitutus erat, vellet, nollet, subjectus esse cogebatur. Bellarm. in Apologia, c. 15. Respons. ad Mendacium 10. And Bellarmine is at the same argument for deposing of kings too: Quia deerant vires temporales Christianis. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont.

lib. v. c. 7. §. Quod si Christiani. Now this is a most lewd untruth, as appears in Tertullian, who lived about the year 200 under Severus. And the Christians then had strength enough against the emperor, had they had right enough with it.

<sup>k</sup> L. de Monar. 1 Rev. xii. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Sic enim Alexander Tertius collum Frederici Primi pede comprimebat. Et dixit, Scriptum est, *Super aspidem et*

under her feet; for this is as good, as literal, as proper an interpretation of these words as that of Innocentius is of the words Gen. i., *God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the less to rule the night*<sup>n</sup>. Thus he or you may give your wits leave to play if you will, for the pope's decretal is a mere fancy. But the true reason indeed why Innocentius made it was that above mentioned. He was now in that greatness, that he thought he might pass any thing upon the Christian world that pleased him; and was therefore resolved to bring it into the body of the canon, that aftertimes might have a law to legitimate and make good their predecessors' usurpation over emperors and kings; and rather than fail of this, he would not spare the abusing of scripture itself: where by the way, dares A. C. say this pope did not err *in cathedra*, when he was so dazzled between the sun and the moon, that he wanted light in the midst of it to expound scripture? Well, I would have the Jesuits leave their practising, and remember, first, that one emperor will not always be able to establish and preserve one only uniform practice and exercise of religion; secondly, that supposing he both can and will so do, yet the Jesuits cannot be certain that that one uniform exercise of religion shall be the Roman catholic; and thirdly, that as there is a body of earth, a world of confusion to eclipse their moon the emperor, so in the same way, and by like interposition, the moon, when it is grown too near in conjunction, may eclipse their sun the pope. And there is no great doubt but he will, considering what some great kings make of the pope's power at this day when it pleases them.

XII.—And since we are in this comparison between the sun and the moon, give me leave a little further to examine who A. C. and his fellow Jesuits with some others would have to be this one emperor. I am not willing to meddle with any the secret designs of foreign states, but if they will express their designs in print, or publish them by great and full authority, I hope then it shall be neither unlawful nor unfit for me, either to take notice or to make use of them. Why then you may be pleased to know, they would have

*Lasiliscum*, &c. Jo. Nauclerus, Chron.      n Gen. i. 16.  
 Generatione 40. circa an. 1170.



Sect. 26. another translation of the empire from Germany to Spain ; they think belike this emperor's line, though in the same house, is not catholic enough : and if you ask me how I know this secret, I will not take it up upon any common report, though I well know what that says ; but I will tell you how I know it. Somewhat above four hundred years after Innocentius made his comment upon the two great lights, the sun and the moon, the pope and the emperor, °a Spanish friar follows the same resemblance between the monarchies of Rome and Spain, in a tract of his intituled, “ The Agreement of the two Catholic Monarchies,” and printed in Spanish in Madrid, anno 1612. In the frontispiece or titlepage of this book there are set out two scutcheons, the one bearing the cross keys of Rome, the other the arms of Castile and Leon, both joined together with this motto ; *In vinculo pacis*, in the bond of peace. On the one side of this there is a portraiture resembling Rome, with the sun shining over it, and darting his beams on St. Peter's keys, with this inscription : *ℙ Luminare majus*, the greater light, that it may govern the city (that is, Rome) and the whole world ; and on the other side there is another image designing Spain, with the moon shining over that, and spreading forth its rays upon the Spanish scutcheon, with this impress : *ℚ Luminare minus*, the less light, that it may be subject to the city (of Rome he means) and so be lord to govern the whole world besides ; and over all this in the top of the titlepage, there is printed in capital letters, *Fecit Deus duo luminaria magna*, God made two great lights. There follows after in this author a discovery at large of this blazoning of these arms, but this is the substance of it, and abundantly enough to shew what is aimed at, by whom and for whom. And this book was not stolen out without the will and consent of the state ; for it hath printed before it all manner of license that a book can well have : for it hath the approbation of Father Pedro de Buyza, of the company of the Jesuits ; of John de Arcediano, provincial of the Dominicans ; of Diego Granero, the licenser

° John de Puente, La convenientia de las dos monarquias catolicas la de la iglesia Romana, y la del imperio Espaniol, y defensa de la precedentia de los reyes catolicos de Espania a todos los reyes del mundo.  
 ℙ Luminare majus, ut præsit urbi et orbi.  
 ℚ Luminare minus, ut subdatur urbi, et dominetur orbi.

appointed for the supreme council of the inquisition; and Sect. 26.  
 some of these revised this book by order from the lords of  
 that council: and last of all the king's privilege is to it,  
 with high commendation of the work. But the Spaniards  
 had need look to it for all this, lest the French deceive them:  
 for now lately Friar Campanella hath set out an eclogue  
 upon the birth of the dolphin, and that *permissu superiorum*,  
 by license from his superiors; in which he says expressly,  
 "That all princes are now more afraid of France than ever,  
 for that there is provided for it *regnum universale*, the univer-  
 sal kingdom or monarchy."

XIII.—But it is time to return; for A. C. in this passage A. C. p. 60.  
 hath been very careful to tell us of a parliament, and of living  
 magistrates and judges besides the law-books. Thirdly, there-  
 fore the church of England (God be thanked) thrives happily  
 under a gracious prince, and well understands that a parlia-  
 ment cannot be called at all times; and that there are visible  
 judges besides the law-books, and one supreme (long may he  
 be, and be happy) to settle all temporal differences (which  
 certainly he might much better perform if his kingdoms were  
 well rid of A. C. and his fellows.) And she believes too, that  
 our Saviour Christ hath left in his church, besides his law-  
 book the scripture, visible magistrates and judges, that is,  
 archbishops and bishops, under a gracious king, to govern  
 both for truth and peace according to the scripture, and her  
 own canons and constitutions, as also those of the catholic  
 church which cross not the scripture and the just laws of the  
 realm. <sup>u</sup>But she doth not believe there is any necessity to  
 have one pope or bishop over the whole Christian world,  
 more than to have one emperor over the whole world; which  
 were it possible, she cannot think fit: nor are any of these

<sup>r</sup> Por orden de los seniores del con-  
 sejo supremo.

<sup>s</sup> Por mandado del rey nuestro se-  
 nior.

<sup>t</sup> Quum Gallia alat 20,000,000 homi-  
 num, ex singulis centenis sumendo  
 unum colliget 200,000 strenuorum mili-  
 tum stipendiatorum, commode, perpetuo-  
 que. Propterea omnes terræ principes  
 metuunt nunc magis a Gallia, quam  
 unquam ab aliis; paratur enim illi reg-

num universale. F. Tho. Campanella  
 Ecloga in Principis Galliarum Delphini  
 nativitate, cum Annot. Descrip. Pari-  
 siis, 1639. Cum permissu superiorum.

<sup>u</sup> Non esse necesse, ut sub Christo  
 sit unus rector totius ecclesie, sed suffi-  
 cit quod sint plures regentes diversas  
 provincias, sicut sunt plures reges gu-  
 bernantes plura regna. Oham. Dial.  
 lib. 2. Tract. 1. p. 1. c. 30. ad 1.

Sect. 26. intermediate judges, or that one which you would have supreme, infallible.

A. C. p. 60. XIV.—But since a kingdom and a parliament please A. C. so well to pattern the church by, I will follow him in the way he goes, and be bold to put him in mind, that in some kingdoms there are divers businesses of greatest consequence, which cannot be finally and bindingly ordered but in and by parliament; and particularly the statute-laws, which must bind all the subjects, cannot be made and ratified but there. Therefore according to A. C.'s own argument, there will be some businesses also found, (is not the settling of the divisions of Christendom one of them?) which can never be well settled but in a <sup>v</sup>general council: and particularly the making of canons, which must bind all particular Christians and churches, cannot be concluded and established but there. And again, as the supreme magistrate in the state civil may not abrogate the laws made in parliament, though he may dispense with the sanction or penalty of the law *quoad hic et nunc*, as the lawyers speak; so in the ecclesiastical body no bishop, no not the pope, (where his supremacy is admitted,) hath power to <sup>x</sup>disannul or violate the true and fundamental decrees of a general council, though he may perhaps dispense in some cases with some decrees. By all which it appears, though somewhat may be done by the bishops and governors of the church, to preserve the unity and certainty of faith, and to keep the church from renting, or for uniting it when it is rent; yet that in the ordinary way which the church hath hitherto kept, some things there are, and upon great emergent occasions may be, which can have no other help than a lawful, free, and well composed general council: and when that cannot be had, the church must pray that it may, and expect till it may; or else reform itself *per partes*, by national or provin-

<sup>v</sup> Propter defectum conciliorum generalium totius ecclesie, quæ sola audent intrepide corrigere omnes, ea mala quæ universalem tangunt ecclesiam, manentia diu incorrecta crescunt, &c. Gerson. Declarat. Defectuum Virorum Ecclesiasticorum, tom. i. p. 209.

<sup>x</sup> Sunt enim indissolubilia decreta, quibus reverentia debita est. Prosper. cont. Collatorem, c. 1. And Turrecre-

mata, who says every thing that may be said for the pope's supremacy, yet dares not say, Papam posse revocare et tollere omnia statuta generalium conciliorum, sed aliqua tantum. Jo. de Turrecr. Summæ de Ecclesia, lib. iii. c. 55. Et postea: Papa non potest revocare decreta primorum quatuor conciliorum, quia non sunt nisi declarativa articulorum fidei. Ibid. c. 57. ad 2.

cial synods, (as hath been said ybefore.) And in the mean Sect. 26, 27. time it little beseems A. C. or any Christian, to check at the wisdom of <sup>z</sup>Christ, if he have not taken the way they think fitting to settle church differences; or if, for the church's sin, or trial, the way of composing them be left more uncertain than they would have it, *that they which are approved may be known*, 1 Cor. xi. 19. But the Jesuit had told me before, that a general council had adjudged these things already. For so he says.

ff. I told him, that a general council, to wit, of Trent, had already judged, not the Roman church, but the protestants, to hold errors. That (saith the B.) was not a lawful council.

33. I.—It is true, that you replied for the council of Trent. Sect. 27. And my answer was, not only, That the council was not legal in the necessary conditions to be observed in a general council, but also, That it was no general council: which, again, you are content to omit. Consider it well: first, Is that council legal, the abettors whereof maintain publicly that it is lawful for them to conclude any controversy, and make it be *de fide*, and so in your judgment fundamental, though it have not, I do not say now the written word of God for warrant, either in express letter or necessary sense and deduction, (as all unerring councils have had, and as all must have that will not err,) but not so much as <sup>a</sup>probable testimony from it; nay, quite *extra*, without the scripture? Nay, secondly, Is that council <sup>b</sup>legal, where the pope, the chief person to be re-

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 24. num. I.

<sup>z</sup> And shall we think that Christ, the wisest King, hath not provided &c. A. C. p. 60. Where I cannot but commend either A. C.'s modesty, that he doth not, or his cunning, that he will not, go so far as some have done before him; though in these words, "Shall we think" &c. he goes too far. Non videretur Dominus discretus fuisse (ut cum reverentia ejus loquar) nisi unicum post se talem vicarium reliquisset, qui hæc omnia potest. Fuit autem ejus vicarius Petrus. Et idem dicendum est de successoribus Petri, cum eadem absurditas sequeretur, si post mortem Petri, humanam naturam

a se creatam sine regimine unius personæ reliquisset. Extravagant. Com. Tit. de Majoritate et Obedientia c. Unam sanctam. In addition. D. P. Bertrandi edit. Paris. 1585.

<sup>a</sup> Etiam si non confirmetur, ne probabili testimonio scripturarum. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 1. Art. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Here A. C. tells us, "That doubtless the Arians also did dislike, that at Nice the pope had legates to carry his messages, and that one of them, in his place, sat as president." Why but, first, it is manifest that Hosius was president at the council of Nice, and not the bishop of Rome, either by himself or his legates. And so much Atha-

Sect. 27. formed, shall sit president in it, and be chief judge in his own cause, against all law, divine, natural, and human, in a place not free, but in or too near his own dominion?—to which all were not called that had deliberative or consultative voice?—in which none had suffrage but such as were sworn to the pope and the church of Rome, and professed enemies to all that called for reformation or a free council? And the pope himself, to shew his charity, had declared and pronounced the appellants heretics, before they were condemned by the council. I hope an assembly of enemies are no lawful council: and I think the decrees of such an one are *omni jure nulla*, and carry their nullity with them through all law.

II.—Again; Is that council general that hath none of the

nasius himself (who was present, and surely understood the council of Nice, and who presided there, as well as A.C.) tells us: Hosius hic est princeps synodorum. (So belike he presided in other councils as well as at Nice.) Hic formulam fidei in Nicæna synodo concepit. And this the Arians themselves confess to Constantius the emperor, then seduced to be theirs; apud S. Athanas. Epist. ad solitar. vitam agentes. But then secondly, I do not except against the pope's sitting as president, either at Nice or Trent; for that he might do, when called or chosen to it, as well as any other patriarch, if you consider no more but his sitting as president. But at Nice the cause was not his own, but Christ's, against the Arians; whereas at Trent, it was merely his own, his own supremacy, and his church's corruptions, against the protestants: and therefore surely not to sit president at the trial of his own cause, though in other causes he might sit as well as other patriarchs. And for that of Bellarmine, de Concil. lib. i. c. 21. §. Tertia conditio, namely, "That it is unjust to deny the Roman prelate his right (jus suum) in calling general councils, and presiding in them, in possession of which right he hath been for 1500 years;" that is but a bold assertion of the cardinal's, by his leave; for he gives us no proof of it but his bare word; whereas the very authentic copies of the councils, published and printed by the Romanists themselves, affirm clearly they were called by emperors, not by the pope;

and that the pope did not preside in all of them. And I hope Bellarmine will not expect we should take his bare word against the council's. And most certain it is, that even as Hosius presided in the council at Nice, and no way that as the pope's legate, so also in the second general council, which was the first of Constantinople, Nectarius bishop of Constantinople presided. Concil. Chalced. Act. vi. p. 136. apud Binium. In the third, which was the first at Ephesus, St. Cyril of Alexandria presided. And though pope Celestine was joined with him, yet he sent none out of the west to that council, till many things were therein finished, as appears apud Act. Concil. tom. ii. c. 16, 17. In the fourth, at Chalcedon, the legates of the bishop of Rome had the prime place. In the fifth, Eutycheus bishop of Constantinople was president. In the sixth and seventh, the legates of the pope were president; yet so as that almost all the duty of a moderator or president was performed in the seventh by Tharasius, bishop of Constantinople; as appears manifestly in the Acts of that council. And since these seven are all the general councils which the Greeks and Latins jointly acknowledge, and that in these other patriarchs and bishops presided as oft, at least, as the bishops of Rome, what is become of Bellarmine's brag, that the pope hath been possessed of this right of presiding in general councils for the space of 1500 years?

<sup>c</sup> Leo X. Bull. Jun. 8. 1520.



eastern churches' consent nor presence there? Are all the Sect. 27. Greeks so become *non ecclesia*, no church, that they have no interest in general councils? It numbers indeed among the subscribers, six Greeks: they might be so by nation, or by title purposely given them; but dare you say they were actually bishops of and sent from the Greek church to the council? Or is it to be accounted a general council, that in many sessions had scarce ten archbishops, or forty or fifty bishops present? And for the west of Christendom, nearer home, it reckons one English, St. Asaph. But cardinal Pole was there too: and English indeed he was by birth, but not sent to that council by the king and church of England, but as one of the pope's legates; and so we find him at the five first sessions of that council: and at the beginning of the council he was not bishop in the church of England; and after he was archbishop of Canterbury, he never went over to the council. And can you prove that St. Asaph went thither by authority? There were but few of other nations; and it may be some of them reckoned with no more truth than the Greeks. In all the sessions under Paul the Third, but two Frenchmen, and sometimes none; as in the six under Julius the Third, when Henry the Second of France protested against that council. And in the end, it is well known how all the French (which were then a good part) held off, till the cardinal of Lorrain was got to Rome. As for the Spaniards, they laboured for many things, upon good grounds, and were most unworthily overborne.

III.—To all this A. C. hath nothing to say, but “That it is A. C. p. 61. not necessary to the lawfulness and generalness of a council, that all bishops of the world should be actually present, subscribe, or consent; but that such promulgation be made, as is morally sufficient to give notice that such a council is called, and that all may come if they will; and that a major part, at least, of those that are present give assent to the decrees.” I will forget, that it was but pag. 59. in which A. C. speaks A. C. p. 59. of all pastors; and those not only summoned, but gathered together. And I will easily grant him, that it is not necessary that all bishops in the Christian world be present and subscribe: but sure it is necessary to the generalness of a

Sect. 27, 28. council that some be <sup>e</sup> there, and authorized, for all particular churches; and to the freedom of a council, that all that come may come safe; and to the lawfulness of a council, that all may come unengaged, and not fastened to a side, before they sit down to argue or deliberate. Nor is such a promulgation as A. C. mentions sufficient, but only in case of contumacy; and that where they which are called and refuse to come have no just cause for their not coming, as too many had in the case of Trent. And were such a promulgation sufficient for the generalness of a council, yet for the freedom and the lawfulness of it it were not.

¶. So (said I) would Arians say of the council of Nice. The bishop would not admit the case to be like:—

Sect. 28. ¶. So indeed you said. And not you alone: it is the common objection made against all that admit not every latter council as fully as that council of Nice, famous through all the Christian world. In the mean time, nor you nor they consider, that the case is not alike, as I then told you. If the case be alike in all, why do not you admit that which was held at Ariminum, and the second of Ephesus, as well as Nice? If you say (as yours do) it was because the pope approved them not, that is a true cause, but not adequate or full: for it was because the whole church refused them<sup>f</sup>; with whom the Roman prelate (standing then entire in the faith) agreed, and so (for his patriariate) refused those councils. But suppose it true that these synods were not admitted, because the pope refused them, yet this ground is gained, that the case is not alike for men's assent to all councils. And if you look to have this granted, that the pope must confirm, or the council is not lawful, we have far more reason to look that this be not denied, That the scripture must not be departed from, in <sup>g</sup>letter, or necessary sense, or the council is

<sup>e</sup> Ut aliqui mittantur, et adveniant, et conveniant, &c. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. i. c. 17. §. Quarta, ut saltem.

<sup>f</sup> Sect. 26. num. I.

<sup>g</sup> Here A. C. tells us, That the Arians thought so of the council of Nice, p. 61, namely, that they departed from

the letter and sense of scripture. They said so indeed: but the testimony of the whole church, both then and since, went with the council against the Arians. So is it not here against the protestants for Trent; for they offer to be tried by that very council of Nice,

not lawful. For the consent and confirmation of scripture is Sect. 28, 29. of far greater authority to make the council authentical, and the decisions of it *de fide*, than any confirmation of the pope can be. Now of these two, the council of Nice, we are sure, had the first, the rule of scripture; and you say it had the second, the pope's confirmation. The council of Trent, we are able to prove, had not the first; and so we have no reason to respect the second. And to what end do your learned men maintain, that a council may make a conclusion *de fide*, though it be simply <sup>h</sup>*extra*, out of all bound of scripture; but out of a jealousy at least, that this of Trent, and some others, have in their determinations left both letter and sense of scripture? Shew this against the council of Nice, and I will grant so much of the case to be like. But what will you say if <sup>i</sup>Constantine required, "that things thus brought into question should be answered and solved by testimony out of scripture?" and the bishops of the Nicene council never refused that rule. And what will you say if they profess they depart not from it, "<sup>k</sup>but are ready by many testimonies of divine scripture to demonstrate their faith?" Is the case then alike betwixt it and Trent? Surely no. But you say that I pretended something else, for my not admitting the case to be alike.

¶ Pretending that the pope made bishops of purpose for his side. But this the bishop proved not.

¶ I.—No: nor had I reason to take on me to prove what Sect. 29. I said not. I know it will be expected I should prove what I say. And it is hard to prove the purpose of the pope's heart. For if it be proved that he made bishops at that time; that some of them were titular only, and had no livelihood to subsist but out of his purse, (and so must hang their judgment at the strings of it;) that some of these thus made were sent to the council and sure not without their errand; yet if the

and all the ancient councils and Fathers of the church, within the first four hundred years, and somewhat further.

<sup>h</sup> So Stapleton often; but the Fathers quite otherwise. Quæ extra evangelium sint, non defendam. Hilar. ad Const. lib. ii.

<sup>i</sup> *Literarum divinitus inspiratarum testimoniiis*, in Syn. Nic. lib. ii. tom. i. per Nicolinum.

<sup>k</sup> *Ibid.* in *Osi sententia*, p. 517. *Parati ex S. Spiritus arbitrio per plurima divinarum scripturarum testimonia demonstrare hæc ita se habere.*

Sect. 29. pope will say he neither made nor sent them to overrule the Holy Ghost at that meeting, or of purpose for his side, (as no question but it will be said,) who can prove it that is not a surveyor of the heart? But though the pope's heart cannot be seen, yet if these and the like presumptions be true, it is a great sign that Trent was too corrupt and factious a meeting for the Holy Ghost to be at;—and sure the case in this not alike at Nice.

II.—That which I said was, That Trent could be no indifferent council to the church, the pope having made himself a strong party in it. And this I proved, though you be here not only content to omit, but plainly to deny the proof. For I proved it thus, (and you answered not,) That there were more Italian bishops there, than of all Christendom besides. More! yea more than double. And this I proved out of the council itself, which you had in your hand in *decimo sexto*; but had no great heart to look it. For where the number of prelates is expressed that had suffrage and vote in that council, the Italians are set down to be one hundred and eighty-seven, and all the rest make but eighty-three. So that there were more Italian bishops by one hundred and four, than of all the rest of Christendom. Sure the pope did not mean to be overreached in this council. And whatsoever became of his infallibility otherwise, he might this way be sure to be infallible in whatsoever he would have determined: and this,

1 Here A. C. is angry, and says, "This was no proof, nor worthy of any answer, or looking into the book for it. First, because it is only a surmise of adversaries, who are apt to interpret to the worst. Secondly, because there might be more Italian bishops there, as being nearer, yet without any factious combination with the pope: as in the Greek councils more Grecians were present." A. C. p. 62. No proof, or a weak one. Let the reader judge that. But why no proof? Because a surmise of adversaries. Is that a surmise of adversaries that is taken out of the council itself? Is that council then become *regnum divisum*, and apt to interpret the worst of itself? Yea, but there were more Italian bishops, as being nearer. Most true; nearer a great deal than the Grecian bishops: but the bishops of France and of some parts of

Germany were almost as near as the Italians themselves. And why then came no more of these that were near enough? Well; A. C. may say what he will. But the pope remembered well the councils of Constance and Basil, and thought it wisdom to make sure work at Trent. For in later times (for their own fears, no doubt) the bishops of Rome have been no great friends to general councils, especially free ones: *Multi suspicantur, quod hæc dissimulaverit Romana curia, et concilia fieri neglexerit, ut possit ad suæ voluntatis libitum plenius dominari, et jura aliarum ecclesiarum liberius usurpare. Quod non assero esse verum, sed quia hujusmodi laborat infamia, ideo, &c.* Pet. de Aliaco, Card. Cameracensis lib. de Reformat. Eccles. in Fascic. rerum expetend. fol. 204. A.

without all doubt, is all the infallibility he hath. So I proved this sufficiently, I think. For if it were not to be sure of a side, give any satisfying reason why such a potent party of Italians, more than double to the whole Christian world, should be there. Shew me the like for Nice, and I will give it that the case is alike between these two councils.

III.—Here Bellarmine comes in to help: but sure it will not help you, that he hath offered at as much against the council of Nice as I have urged against that at Trent. For he tells us, “<sup>m</sup> That in the council at Nice, there were as few bishops of the west present as were of the east at Trent,” but five in all. Be it so: yet this will not make the case alike between the two councils. First, because I press not the disparity in number only; but with it the pope’s carriage, to be sure of a major part. For it lay upon the pope to make sure work at Trent, both for himself and his church. But neither the Greek church in general, nor any patriarch of the east, had any private interest to look to in the council at Nice. Secondly, because I press not so much against the council of Trent, That there were so exceeding many bishops of the west, compared with those of the east, (for that must needs be, when a council is held in the west,) but that there were so many more Italians and bishops obnoxious to the pope’s power, than of all Germany, France, Spain, and all other parts of the west besides. Thirdly, because both Bellarmine and A. C. seek to avoid the dint of this argument by comparing the western with the eastern bishops, and are content to say nothing about the excessive number of Italians to others of the west, that will receive a fuller answer than any of the rest. For though very few western bishops were at the council of Nice, being so remote; yet at the same time pope Sylvester held a council at Rome, in which he with two hundred and seventy-five bishops of the west confirmed the Nicene Creed, <sup>n</sup>and anathematized “all those which should dare to dissolve the definition of that holy and great

<sup>m</sup> In concilio Nicæno primo ex occidente solum fuerunt duo presbyteri missi ex Italia, unus episcopus ex Gallia, unus ex Hispania, et unus ex Africa. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. i. c. 17. §. antepenult.

<sup>n</sup> Omnes qui ausi fuerint dissolvere definitionem sancti et magni concilii quod apud Nicæam congregatum est, anathematizamus. Concil. Rom. 3. sub Sylvestro. Apud Binium, p. 449.



Sect. 29. council." Now let Bellarmine, or A. C., or any else, shew, that when the council of Trent sat, there was another council (though never so privately in regard of their miserable oppression) which sat in Greece, or any where in the east, under any patriarch or Christian bishop, which did confirm the canons of the council of Trent, and anathematize them which admitted them not; and I will confess, they speak home to the comparison between the councils, else a blind man may see the difference; and it is a vast one.

A. C. p. 62. IV.—But here A. C. makes account he hath found a better reply to this, and now tells us, "that neither French, nor Spanish, nor schismatical Greeks did agree with the protestants in those points which were defined in that council; especially after it was confirmed by the pope; as appears by the censure of Jeremias the Greek patriarch." Who agreed with the protestants in the points defined by that council, (as he speaks,) or rather (to speak properly) against the points there defined, I know not. And, for aught A. C. knows, many might agree with them in heart, that in such a council durst not open themselves. And what knows A. C. how many might have been of their opinion, in the main, before the council ended, had they been admitted to a fair and a free dispute? And it may be too, some decrees would have been more favourable to them, had not the care of the pope's interest made them sourer; for else what mean these words, "especially after it was confirmed by the pope?" As for Jeremias, it is true, his censure is, in many things, against the protestants; but I find not that that censure of his is warranted by any authority of the Greek church, or that he gave the protestants any hearing before he passed his censure. And at the most, it is but the censure of a schismatic, in A. C.'s own judgment. And for his flourish which follows, "That east and west would condemn protestants for heretics," I would he would forbear prophesying, till both parts might meet in a free general council that sought Christ more than themselves. But I find the Jesuit hath not done with me yet, but adds:

¶ In fine, the B. wished, that a lawful general council were called to end controversies. The persons present

said, that the king was inclined thereunto, and that there- Sect. 30,31.  
fore we catholics might do well to concur.

**B.** And what say you to my wish? You pretend great love Sect. 30.  
to the truth; would you not have it found? Can you or any  
Christian be offended that there should be a good end of con-  
troversies? Can you think of a better end than by a general  
council? And if you have a most gracious king inclined unto  
it, (as you say it was offered,) how can you acquit yourselves  
if you do not consent? Now here A. C. “ marvels what kind A. C. p. 62.  
of general council I would have, and what rules I would have  
observed in it, which are morally like to be observed, and  
make an end of controversies, better than their catholic ge-  
neral councils.” Truly I am not willing to leave A. C. un-  
satisfied in any thing; nor have I any meaning to trouble the  
church with any new devisings of mine. Any general council  
shall satisfy me, (and, I presume, all good Christians,) that is  
lawfully called, continued, and ended, according to the same  
course and under the same ° conditions which general coun-  
cils observed in the primitive church; which I am sure were  
councils general, and catholic, whatever yours be. But I  
doubt that, after all the noise made about these requisite con-  
ditions, A. C. and his fellows will be found as much, if not  
more defective in performance of the conditions, than in the  
conditions themselves. Well; the Jesuit goes on, for all  
this.

**J.** I asked the **B.** whether he thought a general council  
might err: he said it might.

**B.** I presume you do not expect I should enter into the Sect. 31.  
proof of this controversy, “ Whether a general council may  
err in determination or not.” Yourself brought no proof  
that it cannot; and till that be brought, my speech is good  
that it can: and yet I hope to be found no infringer of any  
power given by Christ to his church. But it seems by that  
which follows, you did by this question, “ Can a general  
council err?” but seek to win ground for your other which  
follows.

° Ex iis conciliis quæ omnium consensu generalia fuerunt, qualia sunt quatuor prima: et ex consuetudine ec-  
clesiæ colligimus quatuor condiciones requiri, et sufficere. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. i. c. 17. §. 2.

Sect. 32. **¶** If a general council may err, what nearer are we then, said I, to unity, after a council hath determined? "Yes," said he, "although it may err, yet we should be bound to hold with it till another come to reverse it."

Sect. 32. **¶** I.—Whether a general council may err or not, is a question of great consequence in the church of Christ. To say it cannot err, leaves the church not only without remedy against an error once determined, but also without sense that it may need a remedy, and so without care to seek it, which is the misery of the church of Rome at this day. To say it can err, seems to expose the members of the church to an uncertainty and wavering in the faith; to make unquiet spirits not only to disrespect former councils of the church, but also to slight and contemn whatsoever it may now determine, into which error some opposers of the church of Rome have fallen. And upon this is grounded your question, "Wherein are we nearer to unity, if a council may err?" But in relating my answer to this you are not so candid, for my words did not sound as yours seem to do, "That we should hold with the council, err or not err, till another came to reverse it;" as if grounds of faith might vary at the racket, and be cast of each side as a cunning hand might lay them.

II.—You forget again, omit at least, (and with what mind you best know,) the caution which I added. For I said the determination of a general council erring was to stand in force, and to have external obedience at the least yielded to it, till Evidence of scripture, or a demonstration to the contrary, made the error appear, and until thereupon another council of equal authority did reverse it. And indeed I might have

p Sect. 33. Consid. 5. num. I. II. And the reason of this is, because to have a general council deceived is not impossible; but altogether impossible it is that demonstrative reason, or testimony divine, should deceive. Hooker, Eccles. Pol. b. ii. §. 7.

q In which case Maldonat puts in the shrewdest argument; namely, that this way we should never have a certain end of controversies. For to try whether any thing were decreed according to the word of God by one general council, we should need another council; and then another to try that, and

so in *infinitem*: so our faith should never have where to settle and rest itself. Maldon. in St. Matth. xviii. 20. But to this I answer, that the ancient church took this way, as will afterward appear in St. Augustine. Next, there is no uncertainty at all; for no general council, lawfully called and so proceeding, can be questioned in another, unless it so fall out that evident scripture or a demonstration appear against it. But either of these are so clear and manifest, that there need be no fear of proceeding in *infinitem*, and leaving the faith in uncertainty in necessities

returned upon you again, If a general council not confirmed Sect. 32.  
 by the pope may err, (which you affirm,) to what end then a  
 general council? And you may answer, Yes: for although a  
 general council may err, yet the pope, as head of the church,  
 cannot. An excellent means of unity, to have all in the  
 church as the pope will have it, whatever scripture say or  
 the church think. And then, I pray, to what end a general  
 council? Will his holiness be so holy as to confirm a general  
 council if it determine against him? And as for <sup>r</sup>Bellar-  
 mine's reasons why a general council should be useful if not  
 necessary, though the pope be infallible, they are so weak in  
 part and in part so unworthy, that I am sorry any necessity  
 of a bad cause should force so learned a man to make use  
 of them.

III.—Here A. C. tells me. “The caution mentioned as A. C. p. 63,  
 omitted makes my answer worse than the Jesuit related it; <sup>64.</sup>  
 and that in two things. First, in that the Jesuit relates it  
 thus: Although it may err; but the caution makes it as if it  
 did actually err. Secondly, in that the Jesuit relates, that  
 we are bound to hold it till another come to reverse it; that  
 is, we not knowing whether it do err or not, but only that it  
 may err. But the caution puts the case so, as if the deter-  
 mination of a general council actually erring were not *ipso*  
*jure* invalid, but must stand in force and have external obedi-  
 ence yielded to it, till not only moral certainty, but evidence  
 of scripture, or a demonstration to the contrary, make the  
 error appear; and when it appears, we must yield our obe-  
 dience till a council of equal authority reverse it, which per-  
 haps will not be found in an whole age. So either the Jesuit  
 relates this speech truly or less disgracefully:” and A. C.  
 thinks that upon better judgment I will not allow this cau-  
 tion. Truly I shall not thank the Jesuit for any his kindness  
 here; and for the caution, I must and do acknowledge it  
 mine even upon advisement, and that whether it make my  
 answer worse or better. And I think further, that the Jesuit  
 hath no great cause to thank A. C. for this defence of his  
 relation.

to salvation. And in curious specula-  
 tions it is no matter whether there be  
 certainty or no, with or without a coun-

cil. §. 33. consid. 5. num. 1. 2.  
<sup>r</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv.  
 c. 7. §. 3, &c.

Sect. 32.  
A. C. p. 63. IV.—First then, the Jesuit (so says A. C.) doth in his relation make it but a supposition, that a general council may err; but the caution expresses it as actually erring. True, but yet I hope this expression makes no general council actually err; and then it comes all to one, whether I suppose that such a council may err or that it do err. And it is fitter for clearing the difficulties into which the church falls in such a case, to suppose (and more than a supposition it is not) a general council <sup>s</sup>actually erring, than as only under a possibility of erring. For the church hath much more to do to vindicate itself from such an error actually being, than from any the like error that might be.

A. C. p. 63. V.—Secondly, A. C. thinks he hath got great advantage by the words of the caution, in that I say, “A general council erring is to stand in force and have external obedience,” at least so far as it consists in silence, patience, and forbearance yielded to it, “till evidence of scripture, or a demonstration to the contrary, make the error appear, and until thereupon another council of equal authority did reverse it.” Well, I say it again. But is there any one word of mine in the caution that speaks of our knowing of this error? Surely not one, (that is A. C.’s addition.) Now suppose a general council actually erring in some point of divine truth, I hope it will not follow that this error must be so gross as that forthwith it must needs be known to private men. And doubtless till they know it, obedience must be yielded; nay, when they know it, (if the error be not manifestly against fundamental verity, in which case a general council cannot easily err,) I would have A. C. and all wise men consider, whether external obedience be not even then to be yielded. For if controversies arise in the church, some end they must have, or they will tear all in sunder; and I am sure no wisdom can think that fit. Why then, say a general council err, and an erring decree be *ipso jure*, by the very law itself invalid; I would have it wisely considered again, whether it be not fit to allow a general council that honour and privilege which all other great courts have, namely, that there be a declaration of the invalidity of its decrees, as well as of the

<sup>s</sup> Synodum generalem aliquoties errasse percepimus. Fidei, lib. ii. Art. 2. c. 19. §. 1. Wald. de Doctrin.



laws of other courts, before private men can take liberty to Sect. 32.  
 refuse obedience. For till such a declaration, if the council stand not in force, A. C. sets up private spirits to control general councils, which is the thing he so often and so much cries out against in the protestants. Therefore it may seem very fit and necessary for the peace of Christendom, that a general council thus erring should stand in force, till evidence of scripture or a demonstration make the error to appear, as that another council<sup>t</sup> of equal authority reverse it. For as for moral certainty, that is not strong enough in points of faith, (which alone are spoken of here.) And if another council of equal authority cannot be gotten together in an age, that is such an inconvenience as the church must bear when it happens. And far better is that inconvenience than this other, <sup>u</sup>that any authority less than a general council should rescind the decrees of it, unless it err manifestly and intolerably; or that the whole church upon peaceable and just complaint of this error neglect or refuse to call a council and examine it, and there come in national or provincial councils to <sup>x</sup>reform for themselves. But no way must lie open to private men to <sup>y</sup>refuse obedience till the council be heard and weighed, as well as that which they say against it, yet with <sup>z</sup>Bellarmino's exception still, "so the error be not manifestly intolerable;" nor is it fit for private men in such great cases as this, upon which the whole peace of Christendom depends, to argue thus: The error appears, therefore the determination of the council is *ipso jure* invalid. But this is far the safer way (I say still, when the error is neither fundamental nor in itself manifest) to argue thus: The determination is by equal authority, and that *secundum jus*, according to law declared to be invalid; therefore the error appears. And it is a more humble and conscientious way for any private man to suffer a council to go before him, than for him

<sup>t</sup> It is not long since A. C. compared councils to parliaments; it was but p. 60. And I hope a parliament and the acts of it must stand in force, though something be mistaken in them, or found hurtful, till another parliament of equal authority reverse it and them: for I presume you will not have any inferior authority to abrogate acts of parliament.

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 33. consid. 4. num. I.

<sup>x</sup> Sect. 24. num. I.

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 38. num. XV.

<sup>z</sup> Non est inferiorum judicare an superiores legitime procedant necne, nisi manifestissime constet intolerabilem errorem committi. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 8. §. Alii dicunt concilium.— Nisi manifeste constet. Jac. Almain in 3. sent. D. 24. q. unica fine.

Sect. 32, 33. to outrun the council: but weak and ignorant men's outrunning both God and his church, is as bold a fault now on all sides, as the daring of the times hath made it common. As for that which I have added concerning the possibility of a general council's erring, I shall go on with it without asking any further leave of A. C.

Sect. 33. For upon this occasion I shall not hold it amiss a little more at large to consider the point of general councils, how they may or may not err; and a little to look into the Roman and protestant opinion concerning them, which is more agreeable to the power and rule which Christ hath left in his church, and which is most preservative of peace established, or ablest to reduce perfect unity into the church of Christ, when that poor ship hath her ribs dashed in sunder by the waves of contention. And this I will adventure to the world but only in the nature of a consideration, and with submission to my mother the church of England, and the mother of us all, the universal catholic church of Christ, as I do most humbly all whatsoever else is herein contained.

Consid. 1. First then, I consider whether all the power that an œcumenical council hath to determine, and all the assistance it hath not to err in that determination, it hath it not all from the <sup>a</sup>catholic universal body of the church and clergy in the church, <sup>b</sup>whose representative it is? And it seems it hath: for the government of the church being not <sup>c</sup>monarchical but as Christ is the head, this principle is inviolable in nature: Every body collective that represents, receives power and privileges from the body which is represented; else a representation might have force without the thing it represents, which cannot be. So there is no power in the council, no assistance to it, but what is in and to the church. But yet then it may be questioned whether the representing body hath <sup>d</sup>all the power, strength, and privilege which the represented hath? And suppose it hath all the legal power,

<sup>a</sup> Si ecclesiæ universitati non est data ulla autoritas, ergo neque concilio generali, quatenus ecclesiam universalem representat. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 16. §. Quod si ecclesia.

<sup>b</sup> Concilium generale ecclesiam representans. Jac. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. unica.—Episcopi sunt ecclesia

representative, ut nostri loquuntur. Bellarm. de Eccles. Milit. lib. iii. c. 14. §. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Sect. 26. num. VIII.

<sup>d</sup> Omnis representatio virtute minor est re ipsa, vel veritate cujus representatio est. Colligitur aperte ex Thom. 1, 2. q. 101. A. 2. ad 2.

yet it hath not all the natural, either of strength or wisdom, Sect. 33. that the whole hath. Now because the representative hath power from the whole, and the main body can meet no other way, therefore the acts, laws, and decrees of the representative, be it ecclesiastical or civil, are binding in their strength. But they are not so certain and free from error as is that wisdom which resides in the whole: for in assemblies merely civil or ecclesiastical, all the able and sufficient men cannot be in the body that represents; and it is as possible so many able<sup>e</sup> and sufficient men (for some particular business) may be left out, as that they which are in may miss, or misapply that reason and ground upon which the determination is principally to rest. Here, for want of a clear view of this ground, the representative body errs; whereas the represented, by virtue of those members which saw and knew the ground, may hold the principle inviolated.

Secondly, I consider, that since it is thus in nature and in civil bodies, if it be not so in ecclesiastical too, some reason must be given why; <sup>Consid. 2.</sup> for that body also consists of men: those men neither all equal in their perfections of knowledge and judgment, whether acquired by industry, or rooted in nature, or infused by God. Not all equal, nor any one of them perfect and absolute, or freed from passion and human infirmities. Nor doth their meeting together make them infallible in all things, though the act which is hammered out by many together must in reason be perfecter than that which is but the child of one man's sufficiency. If then a general council have no ground of not erring from the men or the meeting, either it must not be at all, or it must be by some assistance and power upon them when they are so met together; and this, if it be less than the assistance of the Holy Ghost, it cannot make them secure against error.

I.—Thirdly, I consider, that the assistance of the Holy <sup>Consid. 3.</sup> Ghost is without error: that is no question; and as little

<sup>e</sup> Posset enim contingere quod congregati in concilio generali essent pauci et viles, tam in re, quam in hominum reputatione, respectu illorum qui ad illud concilium generale minime convenissent, &c. Och. Dial. par. 3. lib.

iii. cap. 13.

<sup>f</sup> Ecclesia est unum corpus mysticum per similitudinem ad naturale. Durand. 3. D. 14. q. 2. num. 5. Biel. Lect. 23. in Can. Miss.

Sect. 33. there is that a council hath it. But the doubt that troubles, is, Whether all the assistance of the Holy Ghost be afforded in such a high manner, as to cause all the definitions of a council in matters fundamental in the faith, and in remote deductions from it, to be alike infallible? Now the Romanists, to prove there is infallible assistance, produce some places of scripture; but no one of them infers, much less enforces, an infallibility. The places which Stapleton there rests upon are these: <sup>h</sup> *I will send you the Spirit of truth, which will lead you into all truth.* And, <sup>i</sup> *This Spirit shall abide with you for ever.* And, <sup>k</sup> *Behold I am with you to the end of the world.* To these, others add <sup>l</sup> the founding of the church upon the rock, against which *the gates of hell shall not prevail.* And Christ's prayer for St. Peter, <sup>m</sup> *that his faith fail not.* And Christ's promise, that <sup>n</sup> *where two or three are gathered together in his name, he will be in the midst of them.* And that in the <sup>o</sup> Acts, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.*

II.—For the first, which is, *leading into all truth, and that for ever.* <sup>p</sup> *All* is not always universally taken in scripture. Nor is it here simply for *all truth*: for then a general council could no more err in matter of fact than in matter of faith; in which yet <sup>q</sup> yourselves grant it may err. But *into all* <sup>r</sup> *truth*, is a limited *all*; into all truth absolutely necessary to salvation: and this, when they suffer themselves to be led by the blessed Spirit, by the word of God. And all truth which Christ had before (at least fundamentally) delivered unto them: <sup>s</sup> *He shall receive of mine, and shew it unto you.* And again, <sup>t</sup> *He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, which I have told you.* And for this necessary truth too, the apostles received this promise, not for them-

g *Omnem veritatem infallibiliter docendi, &c.* Stapl. Relect. Præf. ad Lectorem.

h John xvi. 13.

i John xiv. 16.

k Matt. xxviii. 20.

l Matt. xvi. 18

m Luke xxii. 32.

n Matt. xviii. 20.

o Acts xv. 28.

p Prosp. de Vocat. Gent. lib. i. c. 10.

q Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 8. §.

Respondeo quidam, where he saith, Ubi

quæstio est de facto, non de jure, &c. In ejusmodi judiciis concilium errare posse non est dubium.

r *Dubium est an illud Doccebit omnia, S. Joh. xiv. 26. referendum sit ad illud, Quæcumque dixi vobis: quasi non aliud docturum Spiritum Sanctum dicat, quam quod ipse antea docuisset, non repugnabo, si quis ita velit interpretari, &c.* Maldonat. in S. Joh. xiv.

s John xvi. 14.

t John xiv. 26.

selves and a council, but for themselves, and the <sup>u</sup> whole Sect. 33. catholic church; of which a council, be it never so general, is a very little part. Yea, and this very assistance is not so absolute, nor in that manner to the whole church, as it was to the apostles; neither doth Christ in that place speak directly of a council, but of his apostles' preaching and doctrine.

III.—As for Christ's being with them unto the end of the world, the Fathers are so various, that in the sense of the ancient church we may understand him present in <sup>x</sup> majesty, in <sup>y</sup> power, in aid and <sup>z</sup> assistance against the difficulties they should find for preaching Christ, which is the native sense, as I take it. And this promise was made to support their weakness. As for his presence in teaching by the Holy Ghost, <sup>a</sup> few mention it; and no one of them which doth speaks of any infallible assistance, further than the succeeding church keeps to the word of the apostles, as the apostles kept to the guidance of the Spirit. Besides, the <sup>b</sup> Fathers refer their speech to the church universal, not to any council or representative body. And <sup>c</sup> Maldonate adds, "That this his presence by teaching is, or may be, a collection from the place, but is not the intention of Christ."

IV.—For the rock upon which the church is founded, which is the next place, we dare not lay any other foundation than <sup>d</sup> Christ: Christ laid his <sup>e</sup> apostles, no question, but upon himself. With these St. Peter was laid, no man questions, and in prime place of order, (would his claiming successors be content with that,) as appears, and divers Fathers witness, by his particular designment, *Tu es Petrus*; but yet the *rock* even there spoken of, is not St. Peter's person, either only, or properly, but the faith which he professed. And to this, be-

<sup>u</sup> Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 9. §. Alteram. Assistentia Sp. Sancti non est propter concil. sed universam ecclesiam.

<sup>x</sup> S. August. Tr. 50. in S. Joh. Isidor. 1. Sent. cap. 14.

<sup>y</sup> S. Hilar. in Psal. cxxiv. Justin. Martyr. Dial. cum Tryphone. Prosp. Epist. ad Demetriadem.

<sup>z</sup> S. Hilar. in Psal. cxxiv. Prosp. de Vocat. Gent. lib. ii. cap. 2. Leo Serm. 2. de Resurrect. Dom. cap. 3. Isidor. in Jos. c. 20.

<sup>a</sup> S. Cyril. lib. vii. Dial. de Trin. Prosp. Epist. ad Demetriadem.

<sup>b</sup> S. Hilar. in Psal. cxxiv. S. Cyril. lib. vii. de Trin. S. Aug. 6. de Gen. ad Lit. c. 8. S. Leo, Serm. 10. de Nat. Dom. c. 5. Isid. in Jos. c. 12. In all which places, *vobiscum* is either interpreted *cum suis*, or *fidelibus*, or *universa ecclesia*.

<sup>c</sup> Hoc colligitur, sed quaritur non quid colligitur, sed quid dicere voluit. Maldonat. in S. Matt. xxviii.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 11. <sup>e</sup> Ephes. ii. 20.



Sect. 33.

sides the evidence which is in text and truth, the <sup>f</sup> Fathers come in with very full consent. And this, *that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, is not spoken of the not erring of the church principally, but of the <sup>g</sup>not falling away of it from the foundation. Now a church may err, and dangerously too, and yet not fall from the foundation; especially if that of <sup>h</sup>Bellarmino be true, "That there are many things, even *de fide*, of the faith, which yet are not necessary to salvation." Besides, even here again, the promise of this stable edification is to the whole church, not to a council, at least no further than a council builds as a church is built, that is, upon Christ.

V.—The next place is Christ's prayer for St. Peter's faith. The native sense of which place is, that Christ prayed, and obtained for St. Peter perseverance in the grace of God against the strong temptation which was to winnow him above the rest. But to conclude an infallibility hence in the pope, or in his chair, or in the Roman see, or in a general council, though the pope be president, I find no one ancient Father

<sup>f</sup> S. Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph. Qui suam firmavit ecclesiam super petram, ædificatione spirituali.—S. Hilar. lib. vi. de Trin. Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est. Et paulo post: Hæc fides ecclesiæ fundamentum est.—S. Greg. Nyss. ad Trin. adversus Judeos: *Super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam*, super confessionem videlicet Christi.—S. Isid. Pelus. Epist. lib. i. epist. 235. Ut hæc ratione certam omnibus confessionem traderet, quam ab eo inspiratus Petrus tanquam basin ac fundamentum jecit, super quod Dominus ecclesiam suam extruxit.—S. Cyril. Alexand. de Trin. lib. iv. Petram opinor per agnominationem, aliud nihil quam inconeussam et firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit, in qua ecclesia Christi ita fundata et firmata esset, ut non laberetur, &c.—B. Theodor. in Cant. petram appellat fidei pietatem, veritatis professionem, &c. *Et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam*.—S. Greg. Epist. lib. iii. ep. 33. In vera fide persistite, et vitam vestram in petram ecclesiæ, hoc est, in confessione B. Petri apostolorum principis solidatæ.—Theophylact. in Matth. xvi. Super eum ædificavit ecclesiam, quia enim confessus erat, &c. quod hæc con-

fessio fundamentum erit, &c.—S. Aug. in 1 Epist. S. Johan. tract. 10. Quid est, *Super hanc petram*? Super hanc fidem, super id quod dictum est, *Tu es*, &c.—S. Bas. Seleuc. Orat. 25. Hanc confessionem cum nominasset Christus petram, Petrum nuncupat eum qui primum illam est confessus, donans illi hanc appellationem tanquam insigne, et monumentum hujus confessionis. Hæc enim est revera pietatis petra, hæc salutis basis, &c.—S. Jacob. Liturg. *Ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν τῆς πίστεως*, p. 26, &c. And some which join the person of St. Peter, profess it is propter robur confessionis, Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. S. Chrysost. Hom. 2. in Psal. I. S. Ambros. lib. x. in S. Luc. xxiv. And St. Gregory gives it for a rule, when *petra* is read in the singular number, (and so it is here,) *Christus est*, Christ is signified.

<sup>g</sup> Non deficit, S. Bernard. Serm. 79. in Cant. And Bellarmino himself going to prove ecclesiam non posse deficere, begins with this very place of scripture, de Eccles. lib. iii. c. 13.

<sup>h</sup> De Eccl. lib. iii. c. 14. §. Quinto si esset. Multa sunt de fide, quæ non sunt absolute necessaria ad salutem.

that dare adventure it. And <sup>i</sup>Bellarmino himself, beside some popes in their own cause, (and that in epistles counterfeit, or falsely alleged,) hath not a Father to name for this sense of the place till he come down to Chrysologus, Theophylact, and St. Bernard: of which Chrysologus his speech is but a flash of rhetoric; and the other two are men of yesterday compared with antiquity, and lived when (it was God's great grace, and learned men's wonder) the corruption of the time had not made them corrupter than they are. And <sup>k</sup>Thomas is resolute, that what is meant here beyond St. Peter's person is referred to the whole church. And the gloss upon the canon law is more peremptory than he, even to the denial that it is <sup>l</sup>meant of the pope. And if this place warrant not the pope's faith, where is the infallibility of the council, that in your doctrine depends upon it?

VI.—The next place is Bellarmine's choice one, and his first; and he says it is a "<sup>m</sup>proper place for proof of the infallibility of general councils." This place is Christ's promise: "<sup>n</sup>Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. And he tells us, "The strength of the argument is not taken from these words alone, but as they are continued with the former;" and "<sup>o</sup>that the argument is drawn *a minori ad majus*, from the less to the greater." Thus: "<sup>p</sup>If two or three gathered together in my name do always obtain that which they ask at God's hands, to wit, wisdom and knowledge of those things which are necessary for them; how much more shall all the bishops gathered together (in a council) always obtain wisdom and knowledge to judge those things which belong to the direction of the whole church!" I answer; First, it is most true, that here is little strength in these words alone. For, though the Fathers

<sup>i</sup> De Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3.

<sup>k</sup> 2. 2<sup>a</sup>. q. 2. A. 3. Probat enim ex his verbis, fidem ecclesie universalis non posse deficere.

<sup>l</sup> Causa 24. q. 1. c. A. recta. Non de papa, quia papa potest errare.

<sup>m</sup> Testimonia propria sunt tria. Primum est Matt. xviii., &c. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 2. §. 4.—Sed contra, firmitas conciliorum proprie non innitur his verbis. Stapl. Relect. Controvers. 6. q. 4. A. 4. ad 4.—Locus hic non

debet huc proprie accommodari. Valentia in Thom. tom. iii. Disput. 1. R. 1. Puncto 7. §. 45.

<sup>n</sup> Matt. xviii. 19, 20.

<sup>o</sup> Addita argumentatione a minori ad majus, &c. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 2. §. 4. Et Stapl. Relect. Cont. 6. q. 3. A. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Si duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo obtinent semper quod petunt a Deo, &c. Bellarm. ibid. §. 5

Sect. 33. make different interpretations of this place of scripture, yet most of them agree in this, that this place is to be understood of consent in prayer; and this is manifest enough in the text itself. Secondly, I think there is as little strength in them by the argument drawn *a minori ad majus*: and that I prove two ways; first, because though that argument hold in natural and necessary things, yet I doubt it holds not either in voluntary or promised things, or things which depend upon their institution. For he that promises the less, doth not hereby promise the greater; and he which will do the less, will not always do the greater. Secondly, because this argument from the less to the greater can never follow, but where and so far as the thing upon which the argument is founded agrees to the less; for if it do not always agree to the less, it cannot necessarily pass from thence to the greater. Now that upon which this argument is grounded here is, infallible hearing and granting the prayers of two or three met together in the name of Christ. But this infallibility is not always found in this less congregation, where two or three are gathered together. For they often meet and pray, yet obtain not, because “there are divers other conditions necessarily required,” as St. Chrysostom<sup>r</sup> observes, “to make the prayers of a congregation heard, beside their gathering together in the name of Christ.” And therefore it is not extended to a greater congregation or council, unless the same conditions be still observed. Neither doth Christ’s promise, *Ero in medio*, I will be in the midst of them, infer that they, the greater or the less, three or three hundred, have all, even<sup>s</sup> necessary things, infallibly granted unto them as oft as they ask, if they ask not as well as they ought as what

<sup>q</sup> S. Chrys. Hom. 61. in S. Matt. xviii. Ubi duo vel tres pari spiritu et voluntate collecti sunt, &c. Theoph. in S. Matt. xviii. S. Cyprian. lib. iv. epist. 4. S. Hilar. in S. Matt. xviii.

<sup>r</sup> Quomodo igitur a Patre cuncta non consequentur? Quia multæ sunt causæ non impetrandi, &c. S. Chrysost. Hom. in S. Matt. xviii. Et Bellarm. ipse: Si congregari in nomine Christi sit nota ecclesiæ, non erit quomodocunque congregari. Sic enim omnes hæreses, et schismata congregantur in no-

mine Christi. Sed, &c. lib. iv. de Notis Ecclesiæ, c. 2. §. Tertius non.

<sup>s</sup> Etsi Christus adsit in medio talium non adest tamen ad omnem effectum, aut ad hunc qui est judicare de fide. Stapl. Relect. Controv. 6. q. 3. A. 4.— Sed nec illi semper ad Deum respiciunt qui in medio eorum est. Nec Deus sic adest iis qui respiciunt ad ipsum, ut omnem veritatem doceat in instanti et omni tempore simul, &c. Junius in Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 2.

they ought. And yet most true it is, that where more or fewer are gathered together in the name of Christ, there is he in the midst of them; but to assist and to grant whatsoever he shall find fit for them, not infallibly whatsoever they shall think fit to ask for themselves. And therefore St. Cyprian, though he use this very argument *a minori ad majus*, from the less to the greater, yet he presumes not to extend it, as Bellarmine doth, to the obtaining of infallibility; but only useth it in the general way, in which there neither is nor can be doubt of the truth of it: thus: “<sup>t</sup>If two that are of one mind to God-ward can do so much, what might be done if there were unanimity among all Christians?” Undoubtedly more, but not all whatsoever they should ask, unless all other requisites were present. Thirdly, in this their own <sup>u</sup>great champions disagree from Bellarmine, or he from them. For Gregory de Valentia and Stapleton tell us, “That this place doth not belong properly to prove an infallible certainty of any sentence, in which more agree in the name of Christ; but to the efficacy of consent for obtaining that which more shall pray for in the name of Christ, if at least that be for their soul’s health. For else you may prove out of this place, that not only the definition of a general council, but even of a provincial, nay, of two or three bishops gathered together, is valid, and that without the pope’s assent.”

VII.—The last place mentioned for the infallibility of general councils is that, Acts xv., where the apostles say of themselves and the council held by them, <sup>x</sup>*It seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us*. And they might well say it; for they had infallibly the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and they kept close to his direction. But I do not find that any ge-

<sup>t</sup> Si duo unanimes tantum possunt, quid si unanimitas apud omnes esset? S. Cypri. lib. iv. epist. 4.

<sup>u</sup> Non ad infallibilem certitudinem alicujus sententiæ, in quam plures in nomine Christi consentiunt, locus hic evangelii proprie accommodari debet, sed ad efficaciam consensionis plurium ad id impetrandum, quod unanimiter in Christi nomine petunt, si id quidem ad eorum salutem expediat. Secus enim non modo ex illo loco probabitur, &c.

Greg. de Valen. tom. ii. in Thom. Disput. 1. q. 1. punct. 7. §. 45. And although Stapleton approves this argument *a minori ad majus*, yet withal he says, Firmitas conciliorum illis Christi verbis proprie non immititur; quia nec Christus ibi de conciliis episcoporum loquitur, sed de quavis fidelium unanimi congregatione. Nec etsi, &c. Stapl. Relect. Controv. 6. q. 6. A. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Acts xv. 28.

Sect. 33. neral council since, though they did implore (as they ought) the assistance of that blessed Spirit, did ever take upon them to say, *in terminis*, in express terms of their definitions, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis*; It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us. Acknowledging even thereby (as I conceive) a great deal of difference in the certainty of those things which a general council at after determined in the church, and those which were settled by the apostles when they sat in council. But though I do not find that they used this speech punctually and in terms, yet the Fathers, when they met in council, were confident, and spake it out, that they had assistance from the Holy Ghost; yet so as that they neither took themselves nor the councils they sat in as infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, as the apostles were. And Valentia is very right: “<sup>y</sup>That though the council say they are gathered together in the Holy Ghost, yet the Fathers are neither arrogant in using the speech, nor yet infallible for all that.” And this is true, whether the pope approve or disapprove their definitions, though Valentia will not admit that: the pope must be (with him) infallible, whatever come of it. Now though this be but an example, and include no precept, yet both <sup>z</sup>Stapleton and <sup>a</sup>Bellarmino make this place a proper proof of the infallibility of general councils. And <sup>b</sup>Stapleton says, “The decrees of councils are the very oracles of the Holy Ghost;” which is little short of blasphemy. And <sup>c</sup>Bellarmino adds, “That because all other councils borrowed their form from this, therefore other lawful councils may affirm also that their decrees are the decrees of the Holy Ghost;”—little considering therewhile, that it is one thing to borrow the form, and another thing to borrow the certainty and the infallibility of a council. For suppose that after-councils did follow the form of that first council exactly

<sup>y</sup> Quintum argumentum, &c. Aut sunt ergo arrogantes, quod putandum non est, aut infallibiliter definiunt. Respondet Valentia concedendo neutrum: tom. iii. in Thom. Disp. 1. q. 1. punct. 7. §. 45.

<sup>z</sup> Firmitas eorum nititur exemplo primi concilii. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 6. q. 3. A. 4. ad 3.

<sup>a</sup> Et Bellarm. dicit locum hunc esse

tertium e propriis. De Concil. lib. ii. c. 2. §. Tertius locus.

<sup>b</sup> Conciliorum decreta sunt Spiritus Sancti oracula. Stapl. ibid. Sententia orthodoxa prima.

<sup>c</sup> Si illud concilium ex quo formam acceperunt omnia alia concilia asserit decreta sua esse decreta Spiritus Sancti, certe idem asserere possunt cetera legitima concilia, &c. Bellarm. ibid.



in all circumstances, yet I hope no advised man will say, Sect. 33. there is the like infallibility in other councils, where no man sat that was inspired, as was in this, where all that sat as judges were inspired. Or if any Jesuit will be so bold as to say it, he had need bring very good proof for it, and far better than any is brought yet. Now that all councils are not so infallible as was this of the apostles, nor the causes handled in them as there they were, is manifest by <sup>d</sup>one of their own; who tells us plainly, "That the apostles in their council dealt very prudently, did not precipitate their judgment, but weighed all things. For in matters of faith, and which touch the conscience, it is not enough to say, *Volumus et mandamus*, We will and command. And thus the apostles met together in simplicity and singleness, seeking nothing but God, and the salvation of men. And what wonder if the Holy Ghost were present in such a council? *Nos aliter*, &c. But we meet otherwise, in great pomp, and seek ourselves; and promise ourselves, that we may do any thing out of the plenitude of our power. And how can the Holy Ghost allow of such meetings?" And if not allow or approve the meetings, then certainly not concur to make every thing infallible that shall be concluded in them.

VIII.—And for all the places together, weigh them with indifferency, and either they speak of the church (including the apostles) as all of them do; and then all grant the voice of the church is God's voice, divine and infallible: or else they are general, unlimited, and applicable to private assemblies as well as general councils; which none grant to be infallible but some mad enthusiasts. Or else they are limited, not simply into all truth, but all necessary to salvation; in which I shall easily grant a general council cannot err, suffering itself to be led by this Spirit of truth in the scripture, and not taking upon it to lead both the scripture and the Spirit. For suppose these places, or any other, did promise

<sup>d</sup> Vide quam prudenter, agunt non precipitant sententiam, sed singula expendunt. In rebus enim fidei et quæ conscientiam tangunt, non satis est dicere, *Volumus et mandamus*. Vides igitur quomodo conveniunt apostoli, simpliciter conveniunt, nihil nisi Deum quærunt, et aliorum salutem expetunt.

&c. Quid igitur mirum si in hoc concilio fuerit Spiritus Sanctus? &c. Nos aliter convenimus, nempe cum magna pompa, nosque ipsos quærimus; atque nobis pollicemur nihil nobis non licere de plenitudine potestatis. Et quomodo Spiritus Sanctus ejusmodi concilia probare possit? Ferus in Act. xv. 7.

Sect. 33. assistance even to infallibility, yet they granted it not to every general council, but to the catholic body of the church itself; and if it be in the whole church principally, then is it in a general council, but by consequence, as the council represents the whole; and that which belongs to a thing by consequent doth not otherwise nor longer belong unto it than it consents and cleaves to that upon which it is a consequent. And therefore a general council hath not this assistance, but as it keeps to the whole church and spouse of Christ, whose it is to hear his word and determine by it; and therefore if a general council will go out of the church's way, it may easily go without the church's truth.

Consid. 4. I.—Fourthly, I consider that all agree, that the church in general can never err from the faith necessary to salvation: no persecution, no temptation, no *gates of hell* (whatsoever is meant by them) can ever so prevail against it: for all the members of the militant church cannot err, either in the whole faith or in any article of it; it is impossible. For if all might so err, there could be no union between them as members and Christ the head; and no union between head and members, no body, and so no church, which cannot be: but there is not the like consent, that <sup>f</sup>general councils cannot err. And it seems strange to me, the Fathers having to do with so many heretics, and so many of them opposing church authority, that in the condemnation of those heretics this proposition, even in terms, A general council cannot err, should not be found in any one of them that I can yet see. Now suppose it were true, that no general council had erred in any matter of moment to this day, which will not be found true, yet this would not have followed, that it is therefore infallible and cannot err. I have no time to descend into particulars, therefore to the general still. St. Augustine <sup>h</sup>puts a difference between the rules of scripture and the definitions of men. This difference is, *Præponitur scriptura*, that the scripture hath the prerogative. “That prerogative is, that whatsoever is found written in scripture may neither be

<sup>e</sup> Matt. xvi. 28.

<sup>f</sup> *Ecclesia universalis fidem habet indefectibilem, &c. Non quidem in generali synodo congregata, quam aliquoties errasse percipimus, &c. Wald. Doct.*

Fid. lib. ii. Art. 2. c. 19. §. 1.—Sect. 38. num. IV.

<sup>h</sup> S. August. de Bapt. contra Donat. lib. ii. cap. 3.

doubted nor disputed whether it be true or right. But the letters of bishops may not only be disputed, but corrected by bishops that are more learned and wise than they, or by national councils, and national councils by plenary or general: and even plenary councils themselves may be amended, the former by the latter." It seems it was no news with St. Augustine that a general council might err, and therefore inferior to the scripture, which may neither be doubted nor disputed where it affirms. And if it be so with the definition of a council too, (as <sup>k</sup>Stapleton would have it,) that they may neither be doubted nor disputed, where is then the scripture's prerogative? Sect. 33.

II.—I know there is much shifting about this place, but it cannot be wrestled off. <sup>l</sup>Stapleton says first, that St. Augustine speaks of the rules of manners and discipline, and this is Bellarmine's last shift: both are out, and Bellarmine in a contradiction. Bellarmine in a contradiction; for first he tells us "general councils cannot err in <sup>m</sup>precepts of manners;" and then, to turn off St. Augustine in this place, he tells us, that if St. Augustine doth not speak of matter of fact, but of right and of universal questions of right, then is he to be understood of <sup>n</sup>precepts of manners, not of points of faith: where he hath first run himself upon a contradiction, and then we have gained this ground upon him, that either his answer is nothing, or else against his own state of the question, "A general council can err in precepts of manners." So belike, when Bellarmine is at a shift, a general council can and cannot err in precepts of manners. And both are out: for the whole dispute of St. Augustine is against the error of St. Cyprian, followed by the Donatists, which was an error in faith; namely, "That true baptism could not be given by heretics, and such as were out of the church." And the proof which Stapleton and Bellarmine draw out of the subsequent words ("when by any experiment of things that which was shut is opened") is too weak;

<sup>i</sup> Ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora a posterioribus emendari.

<sup>k</sup> Vox ecclesiæ talis est, ut non de ea judicemus rectene an secus docuerit. So Stapl. Relect. c. 4. q. 1. A. 1.

<sup>l</sup> De regulis morum et disciplina.

Relect. Cont. 6. q. 3. A. 4.

<sup>m</sup> De Concil. lib. ii. c. 2. princip.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. cap. 7. §. Potest etiam.

<sup>o</sup> Quando aliquo rerum experimento, quod clausum erat, aperitur.

Sect. 33. for experiment there is not of fact, nor are the words *conclusum est* as if it were of a rule of discipline concluded, as Stapleton cites them, but a further experiment or proof of the question in hand, and pertaining to faith which was then shut up. and. as St. Augustine after speaks, Pwrapped up in cloudy darkness.

III.—Next, Stapleton <sup>q</sup>will have it, that if St. Augustine do speak of a cause of faith, then his meaning is, that later general councils can mend, that is, explicate more perfectly that faith which lay hid in the seed of ancient doctrine. He makes instance, that about the divinity of Christ, the council of Ephesus explicated the first of Nice; Chalcedon, both of them; Constantinople, Chalcedon: and then concludes, “<sup>r</sup>in all which things none of (these) councils taught that which was erroneous.” An excellent conclusion: these councils and these in this thing taught no error, and were only explained; therefore no council can err in any matter of faith; or, therefore St. Augustine speaks not of an emendation of error, but of an explanation of sense; whereas every eye sees neither of these can follow.

IV.—Now that St. Augustine meant plainly, that even a plenary council might err, and that <sup>s</sup>often, (for that is his word,) and that in matter of faith, and might and ought so to be amended in a later council, I think, will thus appear. First, his word is *emendari*, to be amended; which properly supposes for error and faultiness, not explanation. And St. Augustine needed not to go to a word of such a <sup>t</sup>forced sense, nor sure would, especially in a disputation against adversaries. Next, St. Augustine’s dispute is against St. Cyprian and the council held at Carthage, about baptism by hereties; in which point that national council erred, (as now all agree.) And St. Augustine’s deduction goes on, Scripture cannot be other than right, that is, the prerogative of it; but bishops

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. c. 4. *Nebulis involuta.*

<sup>q</sup> Sensus est, quod concilia posteriora emendant, id est, perfectius explicant fidem in semine antiquæ doctrinæ latentem, &c. Stapl. Relect. Contr. 6. q. 3. A. 4.

<sup>r</sup> Qua in re nihil erroneum ullum concilium docuit, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Sæpe.

<sup>t</sup> Not used, but either for *corrigerere* or *auferre*: and so St. Augustine uses the word, *Contra Faust. lib. xx. c. 21.* And Bellarmine, though he interpret it in matter of fact, yet equals the word with *correxerit*, de *Concil. l. 2. c. 8. §. Respond. Quæst.*

may, and be <sup>u</sup>reprehended for it, if peradventure they <sup>x</sup>err Sect. 33. from the truth; and that either by more learned bishops, or by provincial councils. Here reprehension, and that for deviation from the truth, is (I hope) emendation properly, and not explanation only. Then provincial councils, they must <sup>y</sup>yield to general: and to yield is not in case of explanation only. Then it follows, that even plenary councils themselves may be amended, the former by the later; still retaining that which went before, “if peradventure they erred, or made deviation from the truth.” And if this be not so, I would fain know why in one and the same tenor of words, in one and the same continuing argument and deduction of St. Augustine, *reprehendi* should be in proper sense, and *a veritate deviatum* in proper sense, and *cedere* in proper sense, and only *emendari* should not be proper, but stand for an explanation? If you say the reason is, because the former words are applied to men and national councils, both which may err, but this last to general councils, which cannot err; this is most miserable begging of the principle and thing in question.

V.—Again; St. Augustine concludes there, that the general council preceding may be amended by general councils that follow, “<sup>z</sup>when that is known which lay hid before.” Not as Stapleton would have it, lay hid as in the seed of ancient doctrine only, and so needed nothing but explanation; but hid in some darkness or ambiguity, which led the former into error and mistaking, as appears: for St. Augustine would have this amendment made without sacrilegious pride, doubtless of insulting upon the former council that was to be amended; and without swelling arrogancy, sure against the weakness in the former council; and without contention of envy, which uses to accompany man’s frailty, where his or his friend’s error is to be amended by the later council; and in holy humility, in catholic peace, in Christian charity, no question that a schism be not made to tear the church (as here the Donatist’s did) while one council goes to reform the lapse of another, if any be. Now to what end should this

<sup>u</sup> Reprehendi.

<sup>y</sup> Cedere.

<sup>x</sup> Si quid in iis forte a veritate deviatum est.

<sup>z</sup> Quum cognoscitur quod latebat.



Sect. 33. learned Father be so zealous in this work, this highest work that I know in the church, reviewing and surveying general councils, to keep off pride and arrogance and envy, and to keep all in humility, peace, and charity, if after all this noise he thought later councils might do nothing but amend, that is, explain the former?

VI.—That shift which <sup>a</sup>Bellarmino adds to these two of Stapleton is poorest of all, namely, that St. Augustine speaks of unlawful councils; and it is no question but they may be amended, as the second Ephesine was at Chalcedon: for this answer hath no foundation but a peradventure; nor durst Bellarmine rest upon it. And most manifest it is that St. Augustine speaks of councils in general, that they may err, and be amended in doctrine of faith; and in case they be not amended, that then they be condemned and rejected by the church, as this of Ephesus and divers others were. And as for that mere trick of the <sup>b</sup>pope's instruction, approbation, or confirmation, to preserve it from error, or ratify it that it hath not erred, the most ancient church knew it not. He had his suffrage as other great patriarchs had, and his vote was highly esteemed, not only for his place, but for worth too, as popes were then. But that the whole council depended upon him and his confirmation, was then unknown, and I verily think, at this day not believed by the wise and learned of his adherents.

Consid. 5. I.—Fifthly, it must be considered, if a general council may err, who shall judge it? St. Augustine is at <sup>c</sup>*priora a posterioribus*, nothing sure that is less than a <sup>d</sup>general council. Why, but this yet lays all open to uncertainties, and makes way for a whirlwind of a private spirit to ruffle the church. No, neither of these: first, all is not open to uncertainties; for general councils lawfully called and ordered, and lawfully proceeding, are a great and an awful representation, and cannot err in matters of faith; keeping themselves to God's rule, and not attempting to make a new of their own; and are with all submission to be observed by every Christian, where scripture or evident demonstration come not against them. Nor doth it make way for the whirlwind of a

<sup>a</sup> Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 7. §.  
 Respondeo primo forte.

<sup>b</sup> Sect. 26. num. I.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid.

<sup>d</sup> Sect. 32. num. V.

private spirit; for private spirits are too giddy to rest upon Sect. 33. scripture, and too heady and shallow to be acquainted with demonstrative arguments. And it were happy for the church, if she might never be troubled with private spirit still they brought such arguments. I know this is hotly objected against <sup>e</sup>Hooker; the <sup>f</sup>author calls him a “<sup>g</sup>wise protestant,” yet turns thus upon him: “If a council must yield to a demonstrative proof, who shall judge whether the argument that is brought be a demonstration or not?” For every man that will kick against the church will say, the scripture he urges is evident, and his reason a demonstration. And what is this, but to leave all to the wildness of a private spirit? Can any ingenuous man read this passage in Hooker, and dream of a private spirit? For to the question, Who shall judge? Hooker answers, as if it had been then made; “<sup>h</sup>An argument necessary and demonstrative is such,” saith he, “as being proposed to any man and understood, the mind cannot choose but inwardly assent unto it.” So it is not enough to think or say it is demonstrative. The light then of a demonstrative argument is the evidence which itself hath in itself to all that understand it. Well; but because all understand it not, if a quarrel be made who shall decide it? No question <sup>i</sup>but a general council, not a private spirit: first. in the intent of the author; for Hooker in all that discourse makes the sentence of the council <sup>k</sup>binding; and therefore that is made judge, not a private spirit. And then for the judge of the argument it is as plain; for if it be evident to any man, then to so many learned men as are in a council doubtless: and if they cannot but assent, it is hard to think them so impious that they will define against it; and if that which is thought evident to any man be not evident to such a grave assembly, it is probable it is no demonstration, and the producers of it ought to rest, and not to trouble the church.

II.—Nor is this Hooker’s alone, nor is it newly thought on by us; it is a ground in nature which grace doth ever set

<sup>e</sup> Præfat. p. 29.

<sup>f</sup> Dial. dictus, Deus et Rex.

<sup>g</sup> Cordatus protestans.

<sup>h</sup> Præfat. p. 29. And therefore A. C. is much to blame after all this, to talk

of a pretext of seeming evident scripture or demonstration, as he doth, p. 59.

<sup>i</sup> Sect. 32. num. 11.

<sup>k</sup> Præfat. p. 28.

Sect. 33. right, never undermine. And <sup>l</sup>St. Augustine hath it twice in one chapter, "That St. Cyprian and that council at Carthage would have presently yielded to any one that would <sup>m</sup>demonstrate truth." Nay, it is a rule with <sup>n</sup>him, "Consent of nations, authority confirmed by miracles and antiquity, St. Peter's chair and succession from it, motives to keep him in the catholic church, must not hold him against demonstration of truth; <sup>o</sup>which if it be so clearly demonstrated that it cannot come into doubt, it is to be preferred before all those things by which a man is held in the catholic church." Therefore an evident scripture or demonstration of truth must take place every where; but where these cannot be had, there must be submission to authority.

III.—And doth not Bellarmine himself grant this? for, speaking of councils, he delivers this proposition, "That inferiors may not judge whether their superiors (and that in a council) do proceed lawfully or not." But then having bethought himself, that inferiors at all times and in all causes are not to be cast off, he adds this exception, "<sup>p</sup>unless it manifestly appear that an intolerable error be committed." So then, if such an error be, and be manifest, inferiors may do their duty, and a council must yield; unless you will accuse Bellarmine too of leaning to a private spirit: for neither doth he express who shall judge, whether the error be intolerable.

IV.—This will not down with you; but the definition of a general council is and must be infallible. Your fellows tell us, (and you can affirm no more,) "That the voice of the church determining in council is not <sup>q</sup>human, but divine." That is well; divine, then sure infallible: yea, but the proposition sticks in the throat of them that would utter it. It is not divine simply, but in a <sup>r</sup>manner divine. Why but then sure not infallible, because it may speak loudest in that man-

<sup>l</sup> De Bapt. cont. Donat. 2. c. 4.

<sup>m</sup> Uni verum dicenti et demonstranti.

<sup>n</sup> Cont. Fund. cap. 4.

<sup>o</sup> Quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur, ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in catholica teneor: ita si aliquid apertissimum in evangelio. Ibid. cap. 4.

<sup>p</sup> De Concil. lib. ii. c. 8. §. Alii dicunt concilium. Nisi manifestissime

constet intolerabilem errorem committi.

<sup>q</sup> Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 3. A. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Divina suo modo. Ibid. And so A. C. too; who hath opened his mouth very wide, to prove the succession of pastors in the church to be of divine and infallible authority; yet in the close is forced to add, "at least, in some sort." p. 51.

ner in which it is not divine. Nay, more: "The church (for-Sect. 33-  
sooth) is an infallible foundation of faith <sup>s</sup>in an higher kind  
than the scripture: for the scripture is but a foundation in  
testimony, and matter to be believed; but the church as the  
efficient cause of faith, and, in some sort, the very formal." Is  
not this blasphemy? Doth not this knock against all evi-  
dence of truth, and his own grounds that says it? Against all  
evidence of truth; for in all ages, all men that once admitted  
the scripture to be the word of God (as all Christians do), do  
with the same breath grant it most undoubted and infallible.  
But all men have not so judged of the church's definitions,  
though they have in greatest obedience submitted to them. And  
against his own grounds that says it: for the scripture is ab-  
solutely and every way divine; the church's definition is but  
*suo modo*, in a sort or manner, divine. But that which is but  
in a sort can never be a foundation in an higher degree than  
that which is absolute, and every way such: therefore neither  
can the definition of the church be so infallible as the scrip-  
ture; much less *in altiori genere*, in a higher kind than the  
scripture. But because when all other things fail you fly to  
this, that the church's definition in a general council is by  
inspiration, and so divine and infallible, my haste shall not  
carry me from a little consideration of that too.

I.—Sixthly then, if the definition of a general council be Consid. 6.  
infallible, then the infallibility of it is either in the conclu-  
sion and in the means that prove it; or in the conclusion, not  
the means; or in the means, not the conclusion. But it is  
infallible in none of these. Not in the first, the conclusion  
and the means: for there are divers deliberations in general  
councils, where the conclusion is catholic; but the means by  
which they prove it not infallible. Not the second, the con-  
clusion and not the means: for the conclusion must follow  
the nature of the premises or principles out of which it is de-  
duced; therefore, if those which the council uses be some-  
times uncertain, as is proved before, the conclusion cannot be  
infallible. Not in the third the means and not the conclu-  
sion: for that cannot but be true and necessary, if the means  
be so. And this I am sure you will never grant; because if

<sup>s</sup> In altiori genere, viz. in genere parte formalis. Ibid. q. 4. A. 3.  
causa efficientis, atque adeo aliqua ex

Sect. 33. you should, you must deny the infallibility which you seek to establish.

II.—To this (for I confess the argument is old, but can never be worn out nor shifted off) your great master Stapleton (who is miserably hampered in it, and indeed, so are you all) answers, “That the infallibility of a council is in the second course; that is, <sup>u</sup>it is infallible in the conclusion, though it be uncertain and fallible in the means and proof of it.” How comes this to pass? It is a thing altogether unknown in nature and art too, that fallible principles can either father or mother, beget or bring forth, an infallible conclusion.

III.—Well, that is granted in nature and in all argumentation that causes knowledge. But we shall have reasons for it, <sup>x</sup>first, because the church is discursive, and uses the weights and moments of reason in the means; but is prophetic, and depends upon immediate revelation from the Spirit of God in delivering the conclusion. It is but the making of this appear, and all controversy is at an end. Well, I will not discourse here to what end there is any use of means if the conclusion be prophetic, which yet is justly urged; for no good cause can be assigned of it. If it be prophetic in the conclusion, (I speak still of the present church; for that which included the apostles, which had the spirit of prophecy and immediate revelation, was ever prophetic in the definition; but then that was infallible in the means too,) then since it delivers the conclusion not according to nature and art, that is, out of principles which can bear it, there must be some supernatural authority which must deliver this truth; that (say I) must be the scripture. For if you fly to immediate revelation now, the enthusiasm must be yours. But the scriptures, which are brought in the very exposition of all the primitive church, neither say it, nor enforce it. Therefore scripture warrants not your prophecy in the conclusion: and I know no other thing that can warrant it. If you think the tradition of the church can make the world beholden to you.

<sup>t</sup> Relect. Cont. 4. q. 2. ad A. 11.

<sup>u</sup> And herein I must needs commend your wisdom: for you have had many popes so ignorant, grossly ignorant, as that they have been no way able to sift

and examine the means. And therefore you do most advisedly make them infallible in the conclusion without the means. §. 59. num. VIII.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. not. 4.



produce any Father of the church that says this is an universal tradition of the church, that her definitions in a general council are prophetic, and by immediate revelation; produce any one Father that says it of his own authority, that he thinks so; nay, make it appear that ever any prophet, in that which he delivered from God as infallible truth, was ever discursive at all in the means; nay, make it but probable in the ordinary course of prophecy, (and I hope you go no higher, nor will I offer at God's absolute power,) that that which is discursive in the means can be prophetic in the conclusion, and you shall be my great Apollo for ever. In the mean time I have learnt this from <sup>y</sup> yours, "That all prophecy is by vision, inspiration." &c. and that no vision admits discourse; that all prophecy is an illumination, not always present, but when the word of the <sup>z</sup> Lord came to them; and that was not by discourse. And yet you <sup>a</sup> say again, "That this prophetic infallibility of the church is not gotten without study and industry." You should do well to tell us too, why God would put his church to study for the spirit of prophecy, which never any particular prophet was put unto; <sup>b</sup> and whosoever shall study for it shall do it in vain, since prophecy is a <sup>c</sup> gift, and can never be an acquired habit. And there is somewhat in it, that Bellarmine, in all his dispute for the authority of general councils, dares not come at this rock. <sup>d</sup> He prefers the conclusion and the canon before the acts and the deliberations of councils, and so do we; but I do not remember that ever he speaks out, that the conclusion is delivered by prophecy or revelation. Sure he sounded the shore, and found danger here. He did sound it; for a little before he speaks plainly, (would his bad cause let him be constant,) "<sup>e</sup> Councils do deduce their conclusions." What! from inspiration? "No, but out of the word of

<sup>y</sup> Prophetæ audiebant a Deo interius inspirante. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 5. A. 1. ad 3.

<sup>z</sup> *The word of the Lord came unto me*, is common in the Prophets.

<sup>a</sup> Stapl. Relect. cont. 4. q. 2. p. 473.

<sup>b</sup> Propheticam revelationem nullo pacto haberi posse, vel ope natura, vel studio, contra Avicennam Algazalem,

Averrorem, &c. Fran. Picus, 2. Prænot. c. 4.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 10.

<sup>d</sup> De Concil. lib. ii. c. 12.

<sup>e</sup> Concilia non habent, neque scribunt immediatas revelationes, &c. sed ex verbo Dei per rationationem deducunt conclusiones. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. cap. 12. §. Dicuntur.

Sect. 33. God; and that *per ratiocinationem*, by argumentation:” neither have they nor do they write any immediate revelations.

IV.—The second reason why <sup>f</sup>Stapleton will have it prophetic in the conclusion is, “Because that which is determined by the church is matter of faith, not of knowledge; and that therefore, the church proposing it to be believed, though it use means, yet it stands not upon art, or means, or argument, but the revelation of the Holy Ghost: else, when we embrace the conclusion proposed, it should not be an assent of faith, but an habit of knowledge.” This for the first part—That the church uses the means, but follows them not—is all one in substance with the former reason: and for the latter part—That then our admitting the decree of a council would be no assent of faith, but an habit of knowledge—what great inconvenience is there if it be granted? For I think it is undoubted truth, that one and the same conclusion may be faith to the believer that cannot prove, and knowledge to the learned that can. And <sup>g</sup>St. Augustine I am sure, in regard of one and the same thing, even this, the very wisdom of the church in her doctrines, ascribes understanding to one sort of men, and belief to another weaker sort; and <sup>h</sup>Thomas goes with him.

V.—Now for further satisfaction, if not of you, yet of others, this may well be thought on; Man lost by sin the integrity of his nature, and cannot have light enough to see the way to heaven but by grace. This grace was first merited, after given by Christ: this grace is first kindled by faith; by which, if we agree not to some supernatural principles which no reason can demonstrate simply, we can never see our way. But this light, when it hath made reason submit itself, clears the eye of reason; it never puts it out. In which sense, it may be, is that of <sup>i</sup>Optatus, “That the very catholic church itself is reasonable, as well as diffused every where.” By which <sup>k</sup>reason enlightened (which is stronger

<sup>f</sup> Stapl. *ibid.* 374.

<sup>g</sup> Cont. Fund. c. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Thom. p. 1. q. 2. A. 2, ad 1. Nihil prohibet illud, quod secundum se demonstrabile est, et scibile, ab aliquo accipi

ut credibile, qui demonstrationem non capit.

<sup>i</sup> Rationabilis et ubique diffusa. lib. iii.

<sup>k</sup> Ut ipsa fide valentiores facti, quod

than reason) the church in all ages hath been able either to Sect. 33. convert, or convince, or at least <sup>l</sup>stop the mouths of philosophers, and the great men of reason, in the very point of faith where it is at highest. To the present occasion then. The first, immediate, fundamental points of faith, without which there is no salvation, as they cannot be proved by reason, so neither need they be determined by any council, nor ever were they attempted, they are so plain set down in the scripture. If about the sense and true meaning of these, or necessary deduction out of these prime articles of faith, general councils determine any thing, as they have done in Nice and the rest, there is no inconvenience, that one and the same canon of the council should be believed, as it reflects upon the articles and grounds indemonstrable; and <sup>m</sup>yet known to the learned by the means and proof by which that deduction is vouched and made good. And again; the conclusion of a council, suppose that in Nice, about the consubstantiality of Christ with the Father, in itself considered, is indemonstrable by reason; there I believe and assent in faith: but the same conclusion, <sup>n</sup>if you give me the ground of scripture and the Creed, (and somewhat must be supposed in all, whether faith or knowledge,) is demonstrable by natural reason against any Arian in the world: and if it be demonstrable, I may know it, and have an habit of it. And what inconvenience in this? for the weaker sort of Christians, which cannot deduce when they have the principle granted, they are to rest upon the definition only, and their assent is mere faith: yea, and the learned too, where there is not a demonstration evident to them, assent by faith only, and not by knowledge. And what inconvenience in this? Nay, the necessity of nature is such, that these principles once given, the understanding of man cannot rest, but it must be thus. And the <sup>o</sup>apostle would never have required a man to be able to give a reason

credimus intelligere mereamur, non jam hominibus sed Deo intrinsecus mentem nostram firmante et illuminante. S. August. cont. Epist. Fundament. cap. 14.

<sup>l</sup> Omnia genera ingeniorum subdita scripturæ. S. August. cont. Faust. lib. xxii. cap. 96.

<sup>m</sup> Almain. 3. D. 24. q. 1. et Thom.

2. 2æ. q. 1. A. 5. C. Id quod est scitum ab imo homine etiam in statu viæ, est ab alio creditum, qui hoc demonstrare non novit.

<sup>n</sup> Concilium Nicænum deduxit conclusionem ex scripturis. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 12. §. Sic etiam.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 15.

Sect. 33. and an account of the hope that is in him, if he might not be able to know his account, or have lawful interest to give it when he knew it, without prejudicing his faith by his knowledge. And suppose exact knowledge and mere belief cannot stand together in the same person, in regard of the same thing, by the same means, yet that doth not make void this truth. For where is that exact knowledge, or in whom, that must not merely in points of faith believe the article or ground upon which they rest? but when that is once believed, it can demonstrate many things from it. And definitions of councils are not *principia fidei*, principles of faith, but deductions from them.

Consid 7. I.—And now, because you ask, “Wherein are we nearer to unity by a council, if a council may err?” besides the answer given, I promised to consider which opinion was most agreeable with the church, which most able to preserve or reduce Christian peace; the Roman, that a council cannot err, or the protestants’, that it can. And this I propose not as a rule, but leave the Christian world to consider of it, as I do.

II.—First then I consider, whether in those places of scripture before mentioned, or any other, there be promised to the present church an absolute infallibility; or whether such an infallibility will not serve the turn, as <sup>p</sup>Stapleton, after much wiggling, is forced to acknowledge; “One not every way exact: because it is enough if the church do diligently insist upon that which was once received; and there is not need of so great certainty to open and explicate that which lies hid in the seed of faith sown, and deduce from it, as to seek out and teach that which was altogether unknown.” And if this be so, then sure the church of the apostles required guidance by a greater degree of infallibility than the present church; which yet, if it follow the scripture, is infallible enough, though it hath not the same degree of certainty which the apostles had and the scripture hath. Nor can I tell what to make of Bellarmine, who in a whole chapter disputes five prerogatives in certainty of truth <sup>q</sup>that

<sup>p</sup> Relect. Cont. 4. q. 2. Notab. 3. Exacta et omnimoda infallibilitate non indiget, sed satis est semel acceptis, &c.

<sup>q</sup> De Concil. lib. ii. c. 12. §. ult. Cum utraque sint infallibilis veritatis, aequae cetera dici possunt.

the scripture hath above a council; and at last concludes, Sect. 33.  
 “That they may be said to be equally certain in infallible truth.”

III.—The next thing I consider is, Suppose this not exact, but congruous infallibility in the church; is it not residing according to power and right of authority in the whole church, (always understanding the church in this place *pro communitate prelatorum*, for church governors which have votes in councils,) and in a general council, only by power deputed<sup>r</sup> with mandate to determine? The places of scripture with expositions of the Fathers upon them, make me apt to believe this. “St. Peter,” saith <sup>s</sup>St. Augustine, “did not receive the keys of the church, but as sustaining the person of the church.” Now for this particular, suppose the key of doctrine be to let in truth and shut out error, and suppose the key rightly used infallible in this; yet this infallibility is primely in the church docent, in whose person (not strictly in his own) St. Peter received the keys. But here Stapleton lays across my way again, and would thrust me out of this consideration. He <sup>t</sup>grants that St. Peter received these keys indeed, and in the person of the church; but (saith he) that was because he was primate of the church: and therefore the church received the keys finally, but St. Peter formally; that is (if I mistake him not) St. Peter for himself and his successors received the keys in his own right; but to this end, to benefit the church of which he was made pastor. But I keep in my consideration still; for the church here is taken *pro communitate prelatorum*, for all the prelates, that is, for the church as it is docent and regent, as it teaches and governs: for so only it relates to a general council; and so <sup>u</sup>St. Augustine and Stapleton himself understand it in the places before alleged. Now in this sense St. Peter received the keys formally for himself and his suc-

<sup>r</sup> Quod si ecclesiæ universitati non est data illa autoritas; ergo nec concilio generali quatenus ecclesiam universalem representat. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 16. §. Ex his habemus.

<sup>s</sup> Petrus personam ecclesiæ catholicæ sustinet, et huic datæ sunt claves, quæ Petro datæ. De Agon. Christ. c. 30.

<sup>t</sup> Sed propter primatum quem gere-

bat ecclesiæ, ideoque etsi finaliter ecclesiæ accepit, tamen formaliter Petrus accepit. Relect. Cont. 6. q. 3. A. 5.

<sup>u</sup> Ad omnes dicitur, *Pasce oves*, &c. S. August. de Agon. Christ. c. 30. Which cannot be spoken or meant of the laity. Et Bilson. Perpet. Govern. c. 8. fine.



Sect. 33. cessors at Rome, but not for them only; but as he received them in the person of the whole church docent, so he received them also in their right as well as his own, and for them all. And in this sense St. Peter received the keys in the person of the church (by Stapleton's good leave) both finally and formally. For I would have it considered also, whether it be ever read in any classic author, that to receive a thing in the person of another, or sustaining the person of another, is only meant, *finally* to receive it; that is, to his *good*, and not in his *right*. I should think, he that receives any thing in the person of another, receives it indeed to his good, and to his use, but in his right too; and that the formal right is not in the receiver only, but in him or them also whose person he sustains while he receives it. I will take one of <sup>x</sup>Stapleton's own instances. A consul or prime senator in an aristocratical government (such as the church's is ministerially under Christ) receives a privilege from the senate; and he receives it as primarily and as formally for them as for himself, and in the senate's right as well as his own, he being but a chief part, and they the whole. And this is St. Peter's case in relation to the whole church docent and regent, saving that his place and power was perpetual, and not annual, as the consul's was. This stumblingblock then is nothing; and, in my consideration, it stands still, that the church, in this notion, by the hands of St. Peter, received the keys, and all power signified by them; and transmitted them to their successors, who, by the assistance of God's Spirit, may be able to use them, but still in and by the same hands; and perhaps, to open and shut in some things infallibly, when the pope and a general council too (forgetting both her and her rule, the scripture) are to seek how to turn these keys in their wards.

IV.—The third particular I consider is, Suppose in the whole catholic church militant an absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of faith, absolutely necessary to salvation; and that this power of not erring so is not <sup>y</sup>communicable

<sup>x</sup> Stapl. Relect. Cont. 3. q. 1. A. 1. ad 2.

<sup>y</sup> Non omnia illa quæ tradit ecclesia sub definitione judiciali (i. e. in concilio) sunt de necessitate salutis credenda, sed illa duntaxat quæ sic tradit

concurrente universali totius ecclesie consensu, implicite, vel explicite, vere, vel interpretative. Gerson. Tract. de Declaratione Veritatum quæ credendæ sunt, &c. §. 4. par. 1. pag. 414.

to a general council which represents it, but that the council Sect. 33- is subject to error: this supposition doth not only preserve that which you desire in the church, an infallibility, but it meets<sup>z</sup> with all inconveniences, which usually have done, and daily do perplex the church. And here is still a remedy for all things; for if private respects, if <sup>a</sup>bandies in a faction, if power and favour of some parties, if weakness of them which have the managing, if any unfit mixture of state councils, if any departure from the rule of the word of God, if any thing else sway and wrench the council; the whole <sup>b</sup>church upon evidence found in express scripture, or demonstration of this miscarriage, hath power to represent herself in another body or council, and to take order for what was amiss either practised or concluded. So here is a means, without any infringing any lawful authority of the church, to preserve or reduce unity; and yet grant, as I did, and as the <sup>c</sup>church of England doth, "That a general council may err." And this course the church heretofore took; for she did call and represent herself in a new council, and define against the heretical conclusions of the former; as in the case at Ariminum and the second of Ephesus is evident, and in other councils named by <sup>d</sup>Bellarmino. Now the church is never more cunningly abused, than when men out of this truth, that she may err, infer this falsehood, that she is not to be obeyed. For it will never follow, she may err, therefore she may not govern. For he that says, *Obey them which have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls*<sup>e</sup>, commands obedience, and expressly ascribes rule to the church. And that is not only a pastoral power, to teach and direct, but a prætorian also, to control and censure too, where errors or crimes are against points fundamental or of great con-

<sup>z</sup> Possit tamen contingere, quod quamvis generale concilium definiret aliquid contra fidem, ecclesia Dei non exponeretur periculo. Quia possit contingere quod congregati in concilio generali essent pauci et viles tam in re, quam in hominum reputatione, respectu illorum qui ad illud concilium generale minime convenissent. Et tunc illorum leviter error extirparetur per multitudinem meliorum et sapientiorum et famosiorum illis. Quibus etiam multitudo simplicium adhereret magis, &c.

Ocham. Dial. pag. 3. lib. iii. cap. 13.

<sup>a</sup> Many of these were potent at Ariminum and Seleucia.

<sup>b</sup> Determinationibus quæ a concilio vel pontifice summo fiunt super iis dubitationibus, quæ substantiam fidei concernunt, necessario credendum est, dum universalis ecclesia non reclamet. Fr. P. Mirand. Theor. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Artic. XXI.

<sup>d</sup> Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 16. §. Tertio concilium sine papa.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. xiii. 17.

Sect. 33. sequence: else St. Paul would not have given the rule for excommunication<sup>f</sup>; nor Christ himself have put the man that will not hear and obey the church into the place and condition of an ethnic and a publican, as he doth<sup>g</sup>: and Solomon's rule is general, and he hath it twice: *My son, forsake not the teaching or instruction of thy mother*<sup>h</sup>. Now this is either spoken and meant of a natural mother, and her authority over her children is confirmed, Ecclus. iii. 2; and the fool will be upon him that despiseth her, Prov. xv. 20; or it is extended also to our mystical and spiritual mother the church. And so the Geneva <sup>1</sup>note upon the place expresses it. And I cannot but incline to this opinion, because the blessings which accompany this obedience are so many and great, as that they are not like to be the fruits of obedience to a natural mother only, as Solomon expresses them all<sup>k</sup>; and in all this here is no exception of the mother's erring. For *mater errans*, an erring mother, loses neither the right nor the power of a mother by her error. And I marvel what son should shew reverence or obedience, if no mother that hath erred might exact it. It is true, the son is not to follow his mother's error, or his mother into error. But it is true too, it is a grievous crime in a son to cast off all obedience to his mother, because at some time, or in some things, she hath fallen into error. And howsoever this consideration meets with this inconvenience as well as the rest. For suppose (as I said) in the whole catholic militant church, an absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of faith absolutely necessary to salvation; and then, though the mother church, provincial or national, may err, yet if the grandmother, the whole universal church, cannot in these necessary things, all remains safe, and all occasions of disobedience taken from the possibility of the church's erring are quite taken away. Nor is this mother less to be valued by her children, because in some smaller things age had filled her face fuller of wrinkles. For where it is said, that <sup>1</sup>*Christ makes to himself a church without spot or wrinkle*, that is not

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. v. 5.      <sup>g</sup> Matt. xviii. 17.

<sup>h</sup> Prov. i. 8. Vide S. August. Conf. 2. c. 3. and Prov. vi. 20.

<sup>i</sup> *Forsake not thy mother's instruction*, that is, the teaching of the church,

wherein the faithful are begotten by the incorruptible seed of God's word. Annot. in Prov. i. 8.

<sup>k</sup> Prov. vi. 22.

<sup>1</sup> Ephes. v. 27.

understood of the church militant, but of the church triumphant. <sup>m</sup>And to maintain the contrary, is a branch of the spreading heresy of Pelagianism. Nor is the church on earth any freer from wrinkles in doctrine and discipline, than she is from spots in life and conversation.

V.—The next thing I consider is, Suppose a general council take itself to be infallible in all things which are of faith; if it prove not so, but that an error in the faith be concluded, the same erring opinion that makes it think itself infallible makes the error of it seem irrevocable. And when truth which lay hid shall be brought to light, the church (who was lulled asleep by the opinion of infallibility) is left open to all manner of distractions, as it appears at this day. And that a council may err (besides all other instances, which are not few) appears by that error of the council of Constance<sup>n</sup>. And one instance is enough to overthrow a general, be it a council. <sup>o</sup>Christ instituted the sacrament of his body and blood in both kinds. To break Christ's institution is a damnable error, and so confessed by <sup>p</sup>Stapleton. The council is bold, and defines peremptorily, that "to communicate in both kinds is not necessary, with a *non obstante* to the institution of Christ." Consider now with me, is this an error or not? <sup>q</sup>Bellarmino and Stapleton, and you too, say it is not; because to receive under both kinds is not by divine right. No! No sure; for it was not Christ's precept,<sup>r</sup> but his example. Why, but I had thought Christ's institution of a sacrament had been more than his example only, and as binding for the necessities of a sacrament, the matter and form, <sup>s</sup>as a precept; therefore speak out, and deny it to be Christ's institution, or else grant with Stapleton, "it is a damnable error to go against it." If you can

<sup>m</sup> In id progrediuntur (Pelagiani) ut dicant vitam justorum in hoc seculo nullum omnino habere peccatum, et ex his ecclesiam Christi in hac mortalitate perfici ut sit omnino sine macula et ruga. Quasi non sit Christi ecclesia, que in toto terrarum orbe clamat ad Deum: *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*, &c. S. August. l. de Hæresibus, Hæc. 88.

<sup>n</sup> Sess. 13.

<sup>o</sup> Matt. xxvi. 1 Cor. xi. 23.

<sup>p</sup> Return of Untruths upon Mr. Jewel,

Art. 2. Untruth 49.

<sup>q</sup> De Eucharist. 4. c. 26.

<sup>r</sup> Bellarm. *ibid.* §. Vicesimo profertur.

<sup>s</sup> And now lately, in a catechism printed at Paris, 1637, without the author's name, it is twice affirmed thus: "The institution of a sacrament is of itself a command." Conference 14. p. 244. And again, p. 260, "Institution is a precept."

Sect. 33. prove that Christ's institution is not as binding to us as a precept, (which you shall never be able,) take the precept with it, <sup>t</sup>*Drink ye all of this*; which though you shift as you can, yet you can never make it other than it is, a binding precept. But Bellarmine hath yet one better device than this to save the council. He saith, it is a mere calumny, and that the council hath no such thing, "that the *non obstante* hath no reference to receiving under both kinds, but to the time of receiving it, after supper; in which the council saith, the custom of the church is to be observed, *non obstante*, notwithstanding Christ's example." How foul Bellarmine is in this must appear by the words of the council, which are these: "u Though Christ instituted this venerable sacrament, and gave it his disciples after supper under both kinds of bread and wine, yet, *non obstante*, notwithstanding this, it ought not to be consecrated after supper, nor received but fasting. And likewise, that though in the primitive church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds, yet this custom, that it should be received by laymen only under the kind of bread, is to be held for a law which may not be refused. And to say this is an unlawful custom of receiving under one kind, is erroneous; and they which persist in saying so are to be punished, and driven out as heretics." Now, where is here any slander of the council? The words are plain, and the *non obstante* must necessarily (for aught I can yet see) be referred to both clauses in the words following; because both clauses went before it, and hath as much force against receiving under both kinds, as against receiving after supper. Yea, and the after-words of the council couple both together in this reference; for it follows, "*Et similiter*, and so likewise, that though in the primitive church," &c. And a man, by the definition of this council, may be an heretic for standing to Christ's institution in the very

<sup>t</sup> Matt. xxvi. 1 Cor. xi.—Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τῆς σωτηρίου ταύτης ἐντολῆς. in Liturg. S. Chrys.

<sup>u</sup> Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen hoc *non obstante*, non debet confici post cœnam, nec recipi nisi a jejunis. Here Bellarmine stays, and goes no further; but

the council goes on: Et similiter quod licet in primitiva ecclesia sacramenta reciperentur sub utraque specie a fidelibus, tamen hæc consuetudo, ut a laicis sub specie panis tantum suscipiatur, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare. Et asserere hanc esse illicitam, est erroneum: et pertinaciter asserentes sunt arcendi tanquam hæretici. Sess. 13.



matter of the sacrament; and the church's law for one kind Sect. 33.  
may not be refused, but Christ's institution under both kinds may. And yet this council did not err; no: take heed of it.

VI.—But your opinion is more unreasonable than this: for consider any body collective, be it more or less universal whensoever it assembles itself; did it ever give more power to the representing body of it, than binding power upon all particulars and itself? And did it ever give this power otherwise than with this reservation in nature, that it would call again and reform, yea, and if need were, abrogate any law or ordinance upon just cause made evident, that this representing body had failed in trust or truth? And this power no body collective, ecclesiastical or civil, can put out of itself, or give away to a parliament or council, or call it what you will, that represents it. Nay, in my consideration it holds strongest in the church; for a council hath power to order, settle, and define differences arisen concerning faith. This power the council hath not by any immediate institution from Christ, but it was prudently taken up in the church from the *x*apostles' example, so that to hold councils to this end is apparent apostolical tradition written; but the power which councils so held have, is from the whole catholic church, whose members they are; and the church's power from God. And *y*this power the church cannot further give away to a general council, than that the decrees of it shall bind all particulars and itself, but not bind the whole church from calling again; and in the after-calls, upon just cause to order, yea, and if need be, to abrogate former acts. I say, upon just cause: for if the council be lawfully called, and proceed orderly, and conclude according to the rule, the scripture, the whole church cannot but approve the council, and then the definitions of it are binding; and the power of the church hath no wrong in this, so long as no power but her own may meddle, or offer to infringe any definition

*x* Act. xv. In Novo Testamento exemplum celebrationis conciliorum ab apostolis habemus, &c. Joh. de Turcremata, Sum. de Eccles. lib. iii. c. 2. Et firmitas conciliorum nititur exemplo primi concilii. Stapl. Relect. Cont. 6.

q. 3. A. 4. ad 3.

*y* This is more reasonable a great deal than that of Bellarmine, de Concil. ii. c. 18. Pontificem non posse se subijcere sententiæ coactivæ conciliorum.

Sect. 33. of hers made in her representative body, a lawful general council. And certain it is, no power but her own may do it. Nor doth this open any gap to private spirits: for all decisions in such a council are binding; and because the whole church can meet no other way, the council shall remain the supreme, external, living, temporary, ecclesiastical judge of all controversies. Only the whole church, and she alone, hath power, when scripture or demonstration is found and peaceably tendered to her, to represent herself again in a new council, and in it to order what was amiss.

VII.—Nay, your opinion is yet more unreasonable; for you do not only make the definition of a general council, but the sentence of the pope, infallible; nay, more infallible than it: for any general council may err with you, if the pope confirm it not. So belike this infallibility rests not in the representative body, the council, nor in the whole body, the church; but in your head of the church, the pope of Rome. Now I may ask you, to what end such a trouble for a general council? or wherein are we nearer to unity, if the pope confirm it not? You answer, (though not in the conference, yet elsewhere,) that the pope errs not, especially giving sentence in a general council. And why especially? Doth the deliberation of a council help any thing to the conclusion? Surely not in your opinion: for you hold the conclusion prophetic, the means fallible; and fallible deliberations cannot advance to a prophetic conclusion. And just as the council is in Stapleton's judgment for the definition and the proofs, so is the pope in the judgment of <sup>a</sup>Melech. Canus and them which followed him, prophetic in the conclusion. The council then is called but only in effect to hear the pope give his sentence in more state; else what means this of <sup>b</sup>Stapleton, "The pope, by a council joined unto him, acquires no new power, or authority, or certainty in judging, no more than a head is the wiser by joining the offices of the rest of the members to it than it is without them?" or this of <sup>c</sup>Bel-

<sup>z</sup> Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 16. et 17.

<sup>a</sup> Canus de Locis, lib. vi. cap. 8. §. Et quidem in Pontifices summi in conclusione errare nequeant, rationes autem, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Relect. Cont. 6. q. 3. Art. 5. et ibid. Quia ad compescendos importunos hæreticos concilii generalis definitio illustrior est, &c. Et vulgo hominum magis satisfacit, &c.

<sup>c</sup> De Rom. Pont. iv. c. 3. §. At contra,

larmine, "That all the firmness and infallibility of a general council is only from the pope, not partly from the pope and partly from the council?" So belike the presence is necessary, not the assistance; which opinion is the most groundless and worthless that ever offered to take possession of the Christian church. And I am persuaded many learned men among yourselves scorn it at the very heart: and I avow it, I have heard some learned and judicious Roman catholics utterly condemn it. And well they may: for no man can affirm it, but he shall make himself a scorn to all the learned men of Christendom, whose judgments are not captivated by Roman power. And for my own part, I am clear of <sup>d</sup>Jacobus Almain's opinion: "And a great wonder it is to me, that they which affirm the pope cannot err, do not affirm likewise that he cannot sin: and I verily believe they would be bold enough to affirm it, did not the daily works of the popes compel them to believe the contrary." For very many of them have led lives quite contrary to the gospel of Christ; nay, such lives as no Epicurean monster storied out to the world hath outgone them in sensuality, or other gross impiety, if their own historians be true. Take your choice of John<sup>e</sup> the Thirteenth about the year 966, or of Sylvester the Second, about the year 999, or John the Eighteenth, about the year 1003, or Benedict the Ninth, about the year 1033, or Boniface the Eighth, about the year 1294, or Alexander the Sixth, about the year 1492; and yet these and their like must be infallible in their dictates and conclusions of faith. Do your own believe it? Surely no; for <sup>f</sup>Alphonsus a Castro tells us plainly, "That he doth not believe that any man can be so gross and impudent a flatterer of the pope as to attribute this unto him, that he can neither err, nor mistake in expounding the holy scripture." This comes home; and therefore it may well be thought it hath taken

nam. Ex quo apparet totam firmitatem conciliorum legitimorum esse a pontifice, non partim a pontifice, partim a concilio.

<sup>d</sup> Et mirum est, quod adversarii non asserant eum impeccabilem: et credo assererent, nisi quotidiana summorum pontificum opera ad credendum oppositum compellerent. Almain. de Author. Eccles. c. 10. fine.

<sup>e</sup> Platina et Onuphrius in Vitis eorum.

<sup>f</sup> Non enim credo aliquem esse adeo impudentem papæ assentatorem, ut ei tribuere hoc velit, ut nec errare, nec in interpretatione S. S. literarum hallucinari possit. Alphons. a Castro, advers. Hæres. lib. i. c. 4. And the Gloss confesses it plainly in C. 24. q. 1. c. A recta ergo.

Sect. 33. a shrewd purge : for these words are express in the edition at Paris, 1534 ; but they are not to be found in that at Colen, 1539, nor in that at Antwerp, 1556, nor in that at Paris, 1571. § Harding says indeed, Alphonsus left it out of himself in the following editions. Well ; first, Harding says this, but proves it not ; so I may choose whether I will believe him or no : secondly, be it so that he did, that cannot help their cause a whit ; for say he did dislike the sharpness of the phrase, or aught else in this speech, yet he altered not his judgment of the thing. For in all these later editions he speaks as home, if not more than in the first, and says expressly, “<sup>h</sup> That the pope may err, not only as a private person, but as pope ;” and in difficult cases he adds, that the pope ought to consult *viros doctos*, men of learning. And this also was the opinion of the ancient church of Christ concerning the pope and his infallibility. For thus Liberius, and he a pope himself, writes to Athanasius : “ Brother Athanasius, if you think in the presence of God and Christ as I do, I pray subscribe this confession, which is thought to be the true faith of the holy catholic and apostolic church, that we may be the more certain, that you think concerning the faith as we do ; <sup>i</sup> *ut ego etiam persuasus sim inhaesitanter*, that I also may be persuaded without all doubting of those things which you shall be pleased to command me.” Now I would fain know, if the pope at that time were or did think himself infallible, how he should possibly be more certainly persuaded of any truth belonging to the faith by Athanasius his concurring in judgment with him : for nothing can make infallibility more certain than it is, at least, not the concurring judgment of that is fallible, as St. Athanasius was. Beside, the pope complimented exceeding low, that would submit his unerring judgment to be commanded by Athanasius, who, he well knew, could err. Again, in the case of Easter, (which made too great a noise in the church of old,) <sup>k</sup> very many men called for St. Ambrose his judgment in that

§ Harding his Detection of Errors against Jewel, p. 64.

<sup>h</sup> Celestinus erravit non solum ut privata persona, sed ut papa, &c. Alphons. a Castro, advers. Hæres. lib. i. c. 4. Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> ἵνα καὶ γὰρ πεπορθῶς ὁ ἀδιακρίτως περὶ ὧν ἀξιοῖς κελεύειν μοί. Liberius in Epist. ad Athanas. apud Athanas. tom. i. p. 42. edit. Parisiens. 1608. et edit. Paris. Latino-Gr. 1627.

<sup>k</sup> Post Ægyptiorum supputationes et

point, even after the definition of the church of Alexandria Sect. 33. and the bishop of Rome; and this I presume they would not have done, had they then conceived either the pope or his church infallible. And thus it continued down to Lyra's time; for he says expressly, "That many popes, as well as other inferiors, have not only erred, but even quite apostatized from the faith." And yet now nothing but infallibility will serve their turns. And sometimes they have not only taken upon them to be infallible *in cathedra*, in their chair of decision, but also to prophesy infallibly out of the scripture. But prophetic scripture (such as the Revelation is) was too dangerous for men to meddle with which would be careful of their credit in not erring: for it fell out in the time of Innocent the Third, and Honorius the Third, (as <sup>m</sup>Aventine tells us,) "that the then popes assured the world, that destruction was at hand to Saracens, Turks, and Mahometans; which the event shewed were notorious untruths." And it is remarkable which happened anno 1179; for then in a council held at Rome, pope Alexander the Third condemned Peter Lombard of heresy; and he lay under that damnation for thirty and six years, till Innocent the Third restored him, and condemned his accusers. Now Peter Lombard was then condemned for something which he had written about the human nature of our Saviour Christ. So here was a great mystery of the faith in hand, something about the incarnation; and the pope was *in cathedra*, and that in a council of three hundred archbishops and bishops; and in this council he condemned Peter Lombard, and in him his opinion about the incarnation; and therefore of necessity, either pope Alexander erred, and that *in cathedra*, as pope, in condemning him, or pope Innocentius in restoring him: the truth is, pope Alexander had more of Alexander the Great than of St. Peter in him; and being accustomed to warlike em-

Baron. an.  
of 1179. n. 13.

Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ definitionem, episcopi quoque Romanæ ecclesiæ per literas plerique meam adhuc expectant sententiam, quid existimem de die Paschæ. S. Ambr. lib. x. epist. 83.

<sup>1</sup> Ex hoc patet quod ecclesia non consistit in hominibus ratione potestatis vel dignitatis ecclesiasticæ, vel sæcularis,

quia multi principes et summi pontifices, et alii inferiores inventi sunt apostatasse a fide, &c. Lyra in S. Matth. xvi. 18.

<sup>m</sup> Rom. pontifices ex historia, &c. quæ mendacissima esse exitus probavit. Aventin. Annal. Boiorum, lib. vii. p. 529. edit. Basil. 1580.



Sect. 33. ployments, he understood not that which Peter Lombard had written about this mystery; and so he and his learned assistants condemned him unjustly.

VIII.—And whereas you profess <sup>u</sup>after, “That you hold nothing against your conscience,” I must ever wonder much how that can be true, since you hold this of the pope’s infallibility, especially as being prophetic in the conclusion. If this be true, why do you not lay all your strength together, all of your whole society, and make this one proposition evident? For all controversies about matters of faith are ended, and without any great trouble to the Christian world, if you can but make this one proposition good, That the pope is an infallible judge. Till then, this shame will follow you infallibly and eternally, that you should make the pope, a mere man, *principium fidei*, a principle or author of faith; and make the mouth of him whom you call Christ’s vicar sole judge, both of Christ’s word, be it never so manifest, and of his church, be she never so learned and careful of his truth. And for conclusion of this point, I would fain know (since this had been so plain, so easy a way, either to prevent all divisions about the faith, or to end all controversies, did they arise) why this brief but most necessary proposition, “The bishop of Rome cannot err in his judicial determinations concerning the faith.” is not to be found either in letter or sense, in any scripture, in any council, or in any Father of the church, for the full space of a thousand years and more after Christ. For had this proposition been true and then received in the church, how weak were all the primitive Fathers to prescribe so many rules and cautions for avoidance of heresy, as Tertullian, and Vincentius Lirinensis, and others do, and to endure such hard conflicts as they did, and with so many various hereties; to see Christendom so rent and torn by some distempered councils, as that of Ariminum, the second of Ephesus, and others; nay, to see the whole world almost become Arian, to the amazement of itself; and yet all this time not so much as call in this necessary assistance of the pope, and let the world know, that the bishop of Rome was infallible, that so in his decision all differences might cease! For either the Fathers

<sup>u</sup> Apud A. C. p. 68.

of the church, Greek as well as Latin, knew this proposition Sect. 33. to be true, "That the pope cannot err judicially in matters belonging to the faith," or they knew it not. If you say they knew it not, you charge them with a base and unworthy ignorance, no ways like to overcloud such and so many learned men in a matter so necessary, and of such infinite use to Christendom. If you say they knew it and durst not deliver this truth, how can you charge them which durst die for Christ with such cowardice towards his church? And if you say they knew it, and withheld it from the church, you lay a most unjust load upon those charitable souls, which loved Christ too well to imprison any truth, but likely to make or keep peace in his church catholic over the world. But certainly, as no divine of worth did then dream of any such infallibility in him, so is it a mere dream, or worse, of those modern divines who affirm it now. ° And as P St. Augustine sometimes spake of the Donatists, and their absurd limiting the whole Christian church to Africa only, so may I truly say of the Romanists confining all Christianity to the Roman doctrine governed by the pope's infallibility: I verily persuade myself that even the Jesuits themselves laugh at this. And yet unless they say this, which they cannot but blush while they say, they have nothing at all to say. But what is this to us? we envy no man. If the pope's decision be infallible, *legant*, let them read it to us out of the holy scripture, and we will believe it.

IX.—In the mean time take this with you, that most certain it is that the pope hath no infallibility to attend his cathedral judgment in things belonging to the faith. For first, besides the silence of impartial antiquity, divers <sup>9</sup> of your own confess it, yea, and prove it too, by sundry instances.

X.—Secondly, there is a great question amongst the learned, both schoolmen and controversers, "Whether the

° "The wild extent of the pope's infallibility and jurisdiction is a mistake." These are the words of a great Roman catholic uttered to myself: but I will spare his name, because he is living; and I will not draw your envy upon him.

p Puto quod ipsi etiam rideant, quum hoc audiunt, et tamen nisi hoc dicant,

quod erubescant si dicant, non habent omnino quod dicant. Sed quid ad nos? Nemini invidemus. Legant nobis hoc de scripturis sanctis, et credimus. S. August. de Unit. Eccles. cap. 17.

<sup>9</sup> Papa non solum errore personali, sed et errore judiciali potest errare in materia fidei. Almain. lib. de Author. Eccles. c. 10.

Sect. 33. pope coming to be an heretic may be deposed ;” and it is learnedly disputed by <sup>r</sup>Bellarmino. The opinions are different. For the <sup>s</sup>canon law says expressly, “ He may be judged and deposed by the church in case of heresy.” <sup>t</sup>Joh. de Turrecremata is of opinion that the pope is to be deposed by the church, so soon as he becomes an heretic, though as yet not a manifest one, because he is already deprived by divine right : and recites another opinion, “ That the pope cannot be deposed, though he fall into secret or manifest heresy.” <sup>u</sup>Cajetan thinks that the “ pope cannot be deposed but for a manifest heresy ; and that then he is not deposed *ipso facto*, but must be deposed by the church.” <sup>v</sup>Bellarmino’s own opinion is, “ That if the pope become a manifest heretic, he presently ceases to be pope and head of the church, and may then be judged and punished by the church.” Bellarmino hath disputed this very learnedly, and at large ; and I will not fill this discourse with another man’s labours. The use I shall make of it runs through all these opinions, and through all alike. And truly the very question itself supposes that a pope may be an heretic. For if he cannot be an heretic, why do they question whether he can be deposed for being one ? And if he can be one, then whether he can be deposed by the church before he be manifest, or not till after, or neither before nor after, or which way they will, it comes all to one for my purpose : for I question not here his deposition for his heresy, but his heresy. And I hope none of these learned men, nor any other, dare deny but that if the pope can be an heretic, he can err. For every heresy is an error, and more. For it is an error oftentimes against the errant’s knowledge, but ever with the pertinacy of his will. Therefore out of all even your own grounds, if the pope can be an heretic, he can err grossly, he can err wilfully. And he that can so err cannot be infallible in his judgment, private or public : for if he can be an heretic, he can, and doubt-

<sup>r</sup> De Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 30.

<sup>s</sup> Si sit a fide devius. Dist. 40. Can. Si papa.

<sup>t</sup> Jure divino papatu privatus est, &c. Jo. de Turrecr. l. iv. par. ii. c. 20. et Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 30.

<sup>u</sup> Papa factus hæreticus non est ipso

facto, vel jure divino vel humano, depositus, sed deponendus. Cajet. Tract. de Author. Papæ et Concilii, c. 20.

<sup>v</sup> Papa hæreticus manifestus per se desinit esse papa et caput, &c. ; et tum potest ab ecclesia judicari, et puniri. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 30. §. Est ergo quinta.

less will, judge for his heresy, if the church let him alone. Sect. 33.  
 And you yourselves maintain his deposition lawful to prevent this. I verily believe <sup>w</sup>Alb. Pighius foresaw this blow, and therefore he is of opinion “that the pope cannot become an heretic at all.” And though <sup>x</sup>Bellarmino favour him so far as to say his opinion is probable, yet he is so honest as to add, that “the common opinion of divines is against him.” Nay, though <sup>y</sup>he labour hard to excuse pope Honorius the First from the heresy of the Monothelites, and says that pope Adrian was deceived who thought him one; yet <sup>z</sup>he confesses, “That pope Adrian the Second, with the council then held at Rome, and the eighth general synod, did think that the pope might be judged in the cause of heresy; and that the condition of the church were most miserable, if it should be constrained to acknowledge a wolf manifestly raging for her shepherd.” And here again I have a question to ask; Whether you believe the eighth general council or not? If you believe it, then you see the pope can err, and so he not infallible. If you believe it not, then, in your judgment, that general council errs, and so that not infallible.

XI.—Thirdly, it is altogether vain and to no use that the pope should be infallible, and that according to your own principles. Now God and nature make nothing in vain; therefore either the pope is not infallible, or at least, God never made him so. That the infallibility of the pope (had he any in him) is altogether vain and useless, is manifest. For if it be of any use, it is for the settling of truth and peace in the church in all times of her distraction. But neither the church nor any member of it can make any use of the pope’s infallibility that way: therefore it is of no use or benefit at all. And this also is as manifest as the rest. For before the church or any particular man can make any use of this infallibility to settle him and his conscience, he must either know or believe that the pope is infallible: but a man can neither

<sup>w</sup> Pighius, *Ecclesiasticæ Hierarchiæ* lib. iv. cap. 8.

<sup>x</sup> *Communis opinio est in contrarium.* Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 30. §. 2.

<sup>y</sup> De Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 11.

<sup>z</sup> Tamen non possumus negare, quin Adrianus cum Romano concilio, imo et

tota synodus octava generalis senserit, in causa hæresis posse Rom. pont. judicari. Adde quod esset miserrima conditio ecclesiæ, si lupum manifeste grassantem pro pastore agnoscere cogeretur. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. c. 30. §. 5.

Sect. 33. know nor believe it. And first, for belief: for if the church or any Christian man can believe it, he must believe it either by divine or by human faith. Divine faith cannot be had of it: for (as is before proved) it hath no ground in the written word of God; nay, (to follow you closer,) it was never delivered by any tradition of the catholic church. And for human faith, no rational man can possibly believe (having no word of God to overrule his understanding) that he which is fallible in the means, as <sup>a</sup>yourself confess the pope is, can possibly be infallible in the conclusion; and were it so, that a rational man could have human faith of this infallibility; yet that neither is nor ever can be sufficient to make the pope infallible, no more than my strong belief of another man's honesty can make him an honest man if he be not so. Now, secondly, for knowledge; and that is altogether impossible too, that either the church or any member of the church should ever know that the pope is infallible: and this I shall make evident also out of your own principles. For your <sup>b</sup>council of Florence had told us, that three things are necessary to every sacrament: the matter, the form of the sacrament, and the intention of the priest which administers it, that he intends to do as the church doth. Your <sup>c</sup>council of Trent confirms it for the intention of the priest. Upon this ground (be it rock or sand, it is all one; for you make it rock and build upon it) I shall raise this battery against the pope's infallibility. First, the pope, if he have any infallibility at all, he hath it as he is bishop of Rome and St. Peter's successor. <sup>d</sup>This is granted. Secondly, the pope cannot be bishop of Rome, but he must be in holy orders first; and if any man be chosen that is not so, the election is void *ipso facto, propter errorem personæ*, for the error of the person. <sup>e</sup>This also is granted. Thirdly, he that is to be made pope can never be in holy orders but by receiving them from one that hath power to ordain: this is notoriously known; so is it also,

<sup>a</sup> Stapl. Relect. Cont. 4. q. 2. Notab. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, &c. Decret. Eugen. 4. in Concil. Florent.

<sup>c</sup> Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3. §. Alterum privilegium est.

<sup>e</sup> Constantinus ex laico papa circa an. 767. ejectus papatu. Et Steph. III. qui successit, habito concilio statuit, ne quis, nisi per gradus ecclesiasticos ascendens pontificatum, occupare auderet sub pœna anathematis. Decret. Dist. 79. c. Nullus.



that with you order is a sacrament properly so called: and if Sect. 33.  
 so, then the pope, when he did receive the order of deacon or  
 priesthood at the hands of the bishop, did also receive a sa-  
 crament. Upon these grounds I raise my argument, thus :  
 Neither the church nor any member of the church can know  
 that this pope which now sits, or any other that hath been  
 or shall be, is infallible. For he is not infallible unless he be  
 pope, and he is not pope unless he be in holy orders ; and he  
 cannot be so unless he have received those holy orders, and  
 that from one that had power to ordain ; and those holy  
 orders, in your doctrine, are a sacrament ; and a sacrament is  
 not perfectly given, if he that administers it have not *inten-*  
*tionem faciendi quod facit ecclesia*, an intention to do that  
 which the church doth by sacraments. Now who can possibly  
 tell that the bishop which gave the pope orders was, first, a  
 man qualified to give them ; and, secondly, so devoutly set  
 upon his work, that he had at the instant of giving them an  
 intention and purpose to do therein as the church doth ?  
 Surely none but the bishop himself. And his testimony of  
 himself and his own act, such especially as, if faulty, he would  
 be loath to confess, can neither give knowledge nor belief suf-  
 ficient, that the pope, according to this canon, is in holy  
 orders. So upon the whole matter, let the Romanists take  
 which they will, (I give them free choice,) either this ca-  
 non of the council of Trent is false divinity, and there is no  
 such intention necessary to the essence and being of a sacra-  
 ment ; or if it be true, it is impossible for any man to know,  
 and for any advised man to believe, that the pope is infallible  
 in his judicial sentences in things belonging to the faith. And  
 so here again a general council, at least such an one as that of  
 Trent is, can err, or the pope is not infallible.

XII.—But this is an argument *ad hominem*, good against  
 your party only which maintain this council. But the plain  
 truth is, both are errors. For neither is the bishop of Rome  
 infallible in his judicials about the faith, nor is this intention  
 of either bishop or priest of absolute necessity to the essence  
 of a sacrament, so as to make void the gracious institution  
 of Christ, in case by any temptation the priest's thoughts should  
 wander from his work at the instant of using the essentials  
 of a sacrament, or have in him an actual intention to scorn

Sect. 33.

the church. And you may remember, if you please, that a Neapolitan bishop then present at Trent disputed this case very learnedly, and made it most evident, that this opinion cannot be defended, but that it must open a way for any unworthy priest to make infinite nullities in administration of the sacraments. And his arguments were of such strength, *sut cæteros theologos dederint in stuporem*, as amazed the other divines which were present. And concluded, "That no internal intention was required in the minister of a sacrament, but that intention which did appear *opere externo*, in the work itself performed by him; and that if he had unworthily any wandering thoughts, nay more, any contrary intention within him, yet it neither did nor could hinder the blessed effect of any sacrament." And most certain it is, if this be not true, besides all other inconveniences, which are many, no man can secure himself, upon any doubt or trouble in his conscience, that he hath truly and really been made partaker of any sacrament whatsoever, no, not of baptism; and so by consequence be left in doubt whether he be a Christian or no, even after he is baptized. Whereas it is most impossible that Christ should so order his sacraments, and so leave them to his church, as that poor believers in his name, by any unworthiness of any of his priests, should not be able to know whether they have received his sacraments or not, even while they have received them. And yet for all this, such great lovers of truth and such careful pastors over the flock of Christ were these Trent Fathers, that they regarded none of this, but went on in the usual track, and made their decree for the internal intention and purpose of the priest, and that the sacrament was invalid without it.

XIII.—Nay, one argument more there is, and from your own grounds too, that makes it more than manifest that the pope can err, not personally only, but judicially also; and so teach false doctrine to the church, which <sup>h</sup> Bellarmine tells us "no pope hath done or can do." And a maxim it is with you, "That a general council can err, if it be not confirmed by the

f Minorensis episcopus fuit.

g Hist. Trident. lib. ii. p. 276, 277.  
Leidæ, an. 1622.

h Summus pontifex quum totam ec-

clesiam docet, in his quæ ad fidem pertinent nullo casu errare potest. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 3. §. 1.

pope; <sup>i</sup>but if it be confirmed, then it cannot err." Where, Sect. 33. first, this is very improper language: for I hope no council is confirmed till it be finished; and when it is finished, even before the pope's confirmation be put to it, either it hath erred or not erred. If it have erred, the pope ought not to confirm it; and if he do, it is a void act: for no power can make falsehood truth. If it have not erred, then it was true before the pope confirmed it. So his confirmation adds nothing but his own assent: therefore his confirmation of a general council (as you will needs call it) is at the most *signum, non causa*, a sign, and that such as may fail, but no cause of the council's not erring. But then secondly, if a general council confirmed (as you would have it) by the pope have erred, and so can err, then certainly the pope can err judicially. For he never gives a more solemn sentence for truth than when he decrees any thing in a general council. Therefore, if he have erred and can err there, then certainly he can err in his definitive sentence about the faith, and is not infallible. Now that he hath erred, and therefore can err in a general council confirmed, in which he takes upon him to teach all Christendom, is most clear and evident. For the pope teaches in and by the <sup>k</sup>council of Lateran confirmed by Innocent the Third, Christ is present in the sacrament by way of transubstantiation; and in and by the <sup>l</sup>council of Constance, the administration of the blessed sacrament to the laity in one kind, notwithstanding Christ's institution of it in both kinds for all; and in and by the <sup>m</sup>council of Trent, invocation of saints, and adoration of images, to the great scandal of Christianity, and as great hazard of the weak. Now that these particulars among many are errors in divinity, and about the faith, is manifest both by scripture and the judgment of the primitive church. For transubstantiation first, that was never heard of in the primitive church, nor till the council of Lateran; nor can it be proved out of scripture; and taken properly cannot stand with the grounds of Christian religion. As for communion in one kind, Christ's institution is clear against that.

<sup>i</sup> Concilia generalia a pontifice confirmata errare non possunt. Bellarm. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 2. §. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Concil. Later. Can. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Concil. Const. Sess. 13.

<sup>m</sup> Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. Decret. de Invocatione.

Sect. 33. And not only the primitive church, but the whole church of Christ kept it so, till within less than four hundred years. For <sup>n</sup> Aquinas confesses it was so in use even to his time, and he was both born and dead during the reign of Henry the Third of England. Nay, it stands yet as a monument in the very <sup>o</sup> Missal, against the present practice of the church of Rome, that then it was usually given and received in both kinds. And for invocation of saints, though some of the ancient Fathers have some rhetorical flourishes about it, for the stirring up of devotion, (as they thought,) yet the church then admitted not of the innovation of them, but only of the commemoration of the martyrs, as appears clearly in <sup>p</sup> St. Augustine. And when the church prayed to God for any thing, she desired to be heard for the mercies and the merits of Christ, not for the merits of any saints whatsoever. For I much doubt this were to make the saints more than mediators of intercession, which is all that <sup>q</sup> you acknowledge you allow the saints. For I pray, is not *by the merits* more than *by the intercession*? Did not Christ redeem us by his merits? and if God must hear our prayers for the merits of the saints, how much fall they short of sharers in the <sup>r</sup> mediation of redemption? You may think of this. For such prayers as these the church of Rome makes at this day, and they stand (not without great scandal to Christ and Christianity) used, and authorized to be used in the Missal. For instance: upon the feast<sup>s</sup> of St. Nicholas you pray, “that God, by the merits and prayers of St. Nicholas, would deliver you from the fire of hell.” And upon the octaves of St. Peter and St. Paul, <sup>t</sup> you desire God “that you may obtain the glory of

<sup>n</sup> Provide in quibusdam ecclesiis observatur, ut populo sanguis non detur. Thom. p. 3. q. 80. A. 12. C. So it was but in some churches in his time.—Negare non possumus etiam in ecclesia Latina fuisse usum utriusque speciei, et usque ad tempora S. Thomæ durasse. Vasq. in 3. Disput. 216. c. 3. n. 38.

<sup>o</sup> Refecti cibo potuque celesti, Deus noster, te supplices exoramus, &c. In proprio Missarum de Sanctis, Jan. 15. Orat. post Communionem. Et Jan. 21.

<sup>p</sup> Ad quod sacrificium suo loco et ordine homines Dei nominantur, non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, invocantur. S. August. Civ. Dei, lib. xxii. c. 10.

<sup>q</sup> Bellarm. de Sanctor. Beatitud. lib. i. c. 20. §. Ad primum ergo locum, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Sunt redemptores nostri aliquo modo et secundum aliquid. Bellarm. de Indulgent. lib. i. c. 4: et sanctos appellat *numina*, de Imagin. Sanctorum, lib. ii. c. 20. §. 3. Now if this word (*numen*) signify any thing else besides God himself, or the power of God, or the oracle of God, let Bellarmine shew it, or A. C. for him.

<sup>s</sup> Ut ejus meritis et precibus a gehennæ incendiis liberemur. In proprio Missarum de Sanctis, Decemb. 6.

<sup>t</sup> Ut amiborum meritis æternitatis gloriam consequamur. Ibid. Julii 6.

eternity by their merits." And on the "feast of St. Bonaventure, you pray, "that God would absolve you from all your sins by the interceding merits of Bonaventure." And for adoration of images, the <sup>x</sup>ancient church knew it not. And the modern church of Rome is too like to paganism in the practice of it, and driven to scarce intelligible subtilties in her servants' writings that defend it; and this without any care had of millions of souls, unable to understand her subtilties or shun her practice. Did I say the modern church of Rome is grown too like paganism in this point? and may this speech seem too hard? Well, if it do, I will give a double account of it. The one is; It is no harsher expression than they of Rome use of the protestants, and in cases in which there is no show or resemblance: for <sup>y</sup>Becanus tells us, "It is no more lawful to receive the sacrament as the Calvinists receive it, than to worship idols with the ethnics." And Gregory de Valentia enlarges it to more points than one, but with no more truth. "<sup>z</sup>The sectaries of our times," saith he, "seem to err culpably in more things than the Gentiles." This is easily said, but here is no proof: nor shall I hold it a sufficient warrant for me to sour my language, because these men have dipped their pens in gall. The other account, therefore, which I shall give of this speech, shall come vouched both by authority and reason. And first for authority, I could set Ludovicus Vives against Becanus, if I would, who says expressly, "That the making of feasts at the oratories of the martyrs" (which <sup>a</sup>St. Augustine tells us the best Christians practised not) "are a kind of <sup>b</sup>parentalia, funeral feasts, too much resembling the superstition of the Gentiles." Nay, Vives need not say "resembling that superstition," since <sup>c</sup>Tertullian tells

<sup>u</sup> Ejus intercedentibus meritis ab omnibus nos absolve peccatis. Ibid. Julii 14.

<sup>x</sup> In Optatus his time the Christians were much troubled upon but a false report, that an image was to be placed upon the altar. What would they have done if adoration had been commanded? &c. Et recte dictum erat, si talem famam similis veritas sequeretur. Optat. lib. iii. ad finem.

<sup>y</sup> Sicut non licet cum ethnics idola colere. Becan. L. de Fide Heret. servanda, c. 8.

<sup>z</sup> Contingit aliquando hæreticos circa plura errare omnium Gentiles, ut Manichæos, inquit Thomas. Quod nos possumus vere dicere de nostri temporis sectariis, qui culpabiliter in pluribus videntur errare. Valentia in 2. 2æ. Disp. 1. q. 10. punct. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Quod quidem a Christianis melioribus non fit. S. August. de Civ. Dei, lib. viii. c. 27.

<sup>b</sup> Illa quasi parentalia superstitioni Gentilium simillima. Lud. Vives Ibid.

<sup>c</sup> Quod ergo mortuis litabatur, utique parentationi deputabatur, quæ species



Sect. 33. us plainly, “that idolatry itself is but a kind of parentation.” And Vives, dying in the communion of the church of Rome, is a better testimony against you, than Becanus or Valentia, being bitter enemies to our communion, can be against us. But I will come nearer home to you, and prove it by more of your own. For <sup>d</sup>Cassander, who lived and died in your communion, says it expressly, “That in this present case of the adoration of images, you came full home to the superstition of the heathen.” And secondly, for reason I have (I think) too much to give, that the modern church of Rome is grown too like to paganism in this point. For the <sup>e</sup>council of Trent itself confesses, That to believe there is any divinity in images, is to do as the Gentiles did by their idols. And though in some words after, the Fathers of that council seem very religiously careful that all <sup>f</sup>occasion of dangerous error be prevented, yet the doctrine itself is so full of danger, that it works strongly both upon the learned and unlearned, to the scandal of religion and the perverting of truth. For the unlearned first, how it works upon them by whole countries together, you may see by what happened in Asturias, Cantabria, Galicia, no small parts of Spain. For there the people (so she tells me that was an eyewitness, and that since the council of Trent) “are so addicted to their worm-eaten and deformed images, that when the bishops commanded new and handsomer images to be set up in their rooms, the poor people cried for their old, would not look up to their new, as if they did not represent the same thing.” And though he say this is by little and little amended, yet I believe there is very little amendment. And it works upon the learned too more than it should. For it wrought so far upon Lamas

proinde idololatriæ est, quoniam et idololatria parentationis est species. Tert. lib. de Spectaculis, c. 12.

<sup>d</sup> Manifestus est, quam ut multis verbis explicari debeat, imagium et simulachrorum cultum nimium invaluisse, et affectioni seu potius superstitioni populi plus satis indultum esse, ita, ut ad summam adorationem, quæ vel a paganis, suis simulachris exhiberi consuevit, &c. Cassand. Consult. Art. 21. c. de Imaginibus Where he names divers of your own, as namely, Durantus Miniatensis episcopus, John Bilet, Gerson, Durand, Holkot, and Biel,

rejecting the opinion of Thomas, and other superstitions concerning images. Ibid.

<sup>e</sup> Non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas, et veluti olim fiebat a gentibus. Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. Decret. de Invoeat.

<sup>f</sup> Et rudibus periculosi erroris occasionem, &c. Ibid.

<sup>g</sup> Et adeo gens affecta est truncis corrosis et deformibus imaginibus, ut, me teste, quoties episcopi decentiores ponere jubent, veteres suas petant plorantes, &c. Hieron. Lamas Summa, p. 3. c. 3.

himself, who bemoaned the former passage, as that he delivers this doctrine: “<sup>h</sup>That the images of Christ, the blessed Virgin, and the saints, are not to be worshipped, as if there were any divinity in the images, as they are material things made by art, but only as they represent Christ and the saints; for else it were idolatry.” So then belike, according to the divinity of this casuist, a man may worship images, and ask of them, and put his trust in them, as they represent Christ and the saints. For so there is divinity in them, though not as things, yet as representers. And what, I pray, did or could any pagan priest say more than this? for the proposition resolved is this: “The images of Christ and the saints, as they represent their exemplars, have deity or divinity in them.” And now I pray A. C. do you be judge, whether this proposition do not teach idolatry, and whether the modern church of Rome be not grown too like to paganism in this point. For my own part I heartily wish it were not, and that men of learning would not strain their wits to spoil the truth and rent the peace of the church of Christ, by such dangerous, such superstitious vanities; for better they are not, but they may be worse: nay, these and their like have given so great a scandal among us, to some ignorant, though, I presume, well meaning men, that they are afraid to testify their duty to God, even in his own house, by any outward gesture at all. Insomuch that those very ceremonies, which by the judgment of godly and learned men have now long continued in the practice of this church, suffer hard measure for the Romish superstition’s sake. But I will conclude this point with the saying of B. Rhenanus: “<sup>i</sup>Who could endure the people,” says he, “rushing into the church like swine into a sty? Doubtless ceremonies do not hurt the people, but profit them, so there be a mean kept, and the by be not put for the main, that is, so we place not the principal part of our piety in them.”

<sup>h</sup> Imagines Christi et S. matris ejus et sanctorum non sunt venerandæ, ac si in ipsis imaginibus esset divinitas, secundum quod sunt materia arte effigiata, et non secundum quod repræsentant Christum, et sanctos, &c. Sic enim adorare, vel petere aliquid ab iis, esset idololatRIA. Lam. ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Quis ferat populum in templum irruentem, ceu in haram suæ? Certe non ol sunt populo ceremoniæ, sed prosunt, si modus in eis servetur, et caveamus ne πάρεργα τῶν ἔργων loco habeantur, hoc est, ne præcipuam pietatem in illis collocemus. Rhen. annot. in Tertul. de Cor. Mil.

Sect. 33-35. The conference grows to an end, and I must meet it again ere we part. For you say,

ƒ. After this (we all rising) the lady asked the ƒ. whether she might be saved in the Roman faith? He answered, she might.

Sect. 34. ƒ. What! not one <sup>k</sup>answer perfectly related! My answer to this was general, for the ignorant that could not discern the errors of that church, so they held the foundation, and conformed themselves to a religious life. But why do you not speak out what I added in this particular, "That it must needs go harder with the lady, even in point of salvation, because she had been brought to understand very much, for one of her condition, in these controverted causes of religion; and a person that comes to know much had need carefully bethink himself, that he oppose not known truth against the church that made him a Christian?" for salvation may be in the church of Rome, and yet they not find it that make surest of it. Here A. C. is as confident as the Jesuit himself, "that I said expressly, that the lady might be saved in the Roman faith." Truly, it is too long since now for me to speak any more than I have already upon my memory; but this I am sure of, that whatsoever I said of her, were it never so particular, yet was it under the conditions before expressed.

A. C. p. 64.

ƒ. I bade her mark that.

Sect. 35. ƒ. I.—This answer (I am sure) troubles not you. But it seems you would fain have it lay a load of envy upon me, that you profess you bade the lady so carefully mark that. Well, you bade her mark that; for what? for some great matter, or for some new? Not for some new sure: for the protestants have ever been ready for truth and in charity to grant as much as might be; and therefore from the beginning many <sup>l</sup>learned men granted this. So that you needed

<sup>k</sup> Cave ne dum vis alium notare culpæ, ipse noteris calumniæ. S. Hier. advers. Pelagianos, lib. iii.

<sup>l</sup> Nos fatemur sub papatu plurimum esse boni, imo omne bonum Christianum, atque etiam illinc ad nos devenisse, &c. Luther contra Anabaptist.

citante Bellarmino, de Notis Eccles. lib. iv. c. 16. §. penult. Et Field. Appendix, par. 3. c. 2. Et Jos. Hall bishop of Exeter, lib. Of the Old Religion, c. 1. "Many holding Christ the foundation aright, and groaning under the burden of popish trash, &c. by a general re-

not have put such a serious "mark that" upon my speech, Sect. 35. as if none before had, or none but I would speak it. And if your "mark that" were not for some new matter, was it for some great? Yes sure, it was; for what greater than salvation? But then, I pray, mark this too, that "might be saved" grants but a <sup>m</sup>possibility, no sure or safe way to salvation. The possibility I think cannot be denied, the ignorant's especially, because they hold the foundation, and cannot survey the building; and the foundation can deceive no man that rests upon it: but a secure way they cannot go that hold with such corruptions when they know them. Now whether it be wisdom, in such a point as salvation is, to forsake a church in the which the ground of salvation is firm, to follow a church in which it is but possible one may be saved, but very probable he may do worse, if he look not well to the foundation, judge ye. I am sure <sup>n</sup>St. Augustine thought it was not, and judged it a great sin, in point of salvation,

penitance, and assured faith in their Saviour, did find favour with the Lord." D. Geo. Abbot, late archbishop of Canterbury, Answer to Hill, ad Ration. 1. §. 30.

"For my part I dare not deny the possibility of their salvation, who have been the chiefest instruments of ours, &c." Hooker, in his Discourse of Justificat. §. 17. "In former times a man might hold the general doctrine of those churches wherein our Fathers lived, and be saved; and yet since the council of Trent, some are found in it in such degree of orthodoxy, as we may well hope of their salvation." Field. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 47.

"The Latin or western church, subject to the Romish tyranny, was a true church, in which a saving profession of the truth of Christ was found." Jos. Hall bishop of Exeter, lib. Of the Old Religion, fine, in his advertisement to the reader, p. 207.

Non pauci retinuerunt Christum fundamentum, &c. Mornæus, Tract. de Ecclesia, c. 9. fine.—Inter sordes istas, ista quæ summo cum periculo expectetur salus, non ipsorum additamentis, sed iis, quæ nobiscum habent communia, fundamentis est attribuenda. Jo. Prideaux, Læctione 9. fine.—Papa aliquam adhuc religionis formam relinquît, spem vitæ æternæ non tollit, &c.

Calv. Instruct. advers. Libertinos, c. 4.

<sup>m</sup> Here A. C. gets another snatch, and tells us, "That to grant a possibility of salvation in the Roman church, is the free confession of an adversary, and therefore is of force against us, and extorted by truth: but to say that salvation is more securely and easily to be had in the protestant faith, that is but their partial opinion in their own behalf, and of no force, especially with Roman catholics." I easily believe this latter part, that this, as A. C. and the rest use the matter with their proselytes, shall be of little or no force with Roman catholics. But it will behove them that it be of force: for let any indifferent man weigh the necessary requisites to salvation, and he shall find this no partial opinion, but very plain and real verity, that the protestant, living according to his belief, is upon the safer way to heaven. And as for my confession, let them enforce it as far as they can against me, so they observe my limitations; which if they do, A. C. and his fellows will (of all the rest) have but little comfort in such a limited possibility.

<sup>n</sup> De Bapt. cont. Don. lib. i. c. 3. Gravier peccant in rebus ad salutem animæ pertinentibus, &c. eo solo quod certis incerta præponerent.

Sect. 35. for a man to prefer *incerta certis*, uncertainties and naked possibilities before an evident and certain course. And °Bellarmine is of opinion, and that in the point of justification, “that in regard of the uncertainty of our own righteousness, and of the danger of vainglory, *tutissimum est*, it is safest to repose our whole trust in the merey and goodness of God.” And surely, if there be one safer way than another, as he confesses there is, he is no wise man, that in a matter of so great moment will not betake himself to the safest way. And therefore even you yourselves in the point of condignity of merit, though you write it and preach it boisterously to the people, yet you are content to die, renouncing the condignity of all your own merits, and trust to Christ’s. Now surely, if you will not venture to die as you live, live and believe in time as you mean to die.

II.—And one thing more, because you bid mark this, let me remember to tell you for the benefit of others. Upon this very point—“that we acknowledge an honest ignorant papist may be saved”—you and your like work upon the advantage of our charity and your own want of it to abuse the weak. For thus I am told you work upon them: “You see the protestants (at least many of them) confess there may be salvation in our church; we absolutely deny there is salvation in theirs: therefore it is safer to come to ours than to stay in theirs; to be where almost all grant salvation, than where the greater part of the world deny it.” This argument is very prevailing with men that cannot weigh it, and with women especially that are put in fear by pviolent (though causeless) denying heaven unto them. And some of your party since this have set out a book called “Charity mistaken;” but beside the answer fully given to it, this alone is sufficient to confute it. First, that in this our charity (whatever yours be) is not mistaken, unless the charity of

° Propter incertitudinem propriae justitiae, et periculum inanis gloriae, tutissimum est fiduciam totam in sola Dei misericordia et benignitate reponere. Bellarm. de Justif. lib. v. c. 7. §. Sit tertia propositio.

p And this piece of cunning to affright the weak was in use in Justin Martyr’s

time. Quosdam scimus, &c. ad iracundiam suam evangelium pertrahentes, &c. quibus si potestas ea obtigisset ut nonnullos gehennae traderent, orbem quoque universum consumpissent. Just. Martyr. Epist. ad Zenam et Serenum. And here it is, ad iracundiam suam ecclesiam pertrahentes, &c.



the church herself were mistaken in the case of the Donatists, Sect. 35. as shall <sup>q</sup>after appear. Secondly, even mistaken charity (if such it were) is far better than none at all. And if the mistaken be ours, the none is yours. Yea, but A. C. tells <sup>A. C. p. 56.</sup> us, “ That this denial of salvation is grounded upon charity, as were the like threats of Christ and the holy Fathers. For there is but one true faith, and one true church, and out of that there is no salvation; *and he that will not hear the church, let him be as a heathen and a publican*<sup>r</sup>: therefore he says, it is more charity to forewarn us of the danger by these threats, than to let us run into it through a false security.” It is true that there is but one true faith, and but one true church; but that one, both faith and church, is the <sup>s</sup>catholic Christian, not the particular Roman. And this catholic Christian church, he that will not both hear and obey, yea, and the particular church in which he lives too, so far as it in necessities agrees with the universal, is in as bad condition as a heathen and a publican, and perhaps in some respects worse; and were we in this case, we should thank A. C. for giving us warning of our danger. But it is not so: for he thunders out all these threats and denial of salvation, because we join not with the Roman church in all things, as if her corruptions were part of the catholic faith of Christ. So the whole passage is a mere begging of the question, and then threatening upon it, without all ground of reason or charity. In the mean time let A. C. look to himself, that in his false security he run not into the danger and loss of his own salvation, while he would seem to take such care of ours. But though this argument prevails with the weak, yet it is much stronger in the cunning than the true force of it: for all arguments are very moving, that lay their ground upon <sup>t</sup>the adversaries’ confession, especially if it be confessed and avouched to be true. But if you would speak truly, and say,

<sup>q</sup> Sect. 35. num. III.

<sup>r</sup> Matt. xviii. 17.

<sup>s</sup> And this is proved by the Creed, in which we profess our belief of the catholic, not of the Roman church.

<sup>t</sup> “ This is a free confession of the adversaries’ argument against themselves, and therefore is of force.” A. C. p. 64. But every confession of adversaries or others is to be taken with

its qualities and conditions: if you leave out or change these, you wrong the confession, and then it is of no force; and so doth A. C. here. And though Bellarmine makes the confession of the adversary a note of the true church, de Notis Eccles. lib. iv. c. 16, yet in the very beginning, where he lays his ground, §. i. he lays it in a plain fallacy *a secundum quid ad simpliciter*

Sect. 35. Many protestants indeed confess there is salvation possible to be attained in the Roman church; but they say withal that the errors of that church are so many (<sup>u</sup>and some so great as weaken the foundation) that it is very hard to go that way to heaven, especially to them that have had the truth manifested; the heart of this argument were utterly broken. Besides, the force of this argument lies upon two things, one directly expressed, the other but as upon the by.

III.—That which is expressed is, We and our adversaries consent that there is salvation to some in the Roman church. What! would you have us as malicious (at least as rash) as yourselves are to us, and deny you so much as possibility of salvation? If we should, we might make you in some things strain for a proof. *But we have not so learned Christ*, as either to return evil for evil in this heady course, or to deny salvation to some ignorant silly souls, whose humble, peaceable obedience makes them safe among any part of men that profess the foundation, Christ: and therefore seek not to help our cause by denying this comfort to silly Christians, as you most fiercely do where you can come to work upon them. And this was an old trick of the Donatists; for in the point of baptism, (whether that sacrament was true in the catholic church or in the part of Donatus,) they exhorted all to be baptized among them. Why? Because both parts granted that baptism was true among the Donatists; which that peevish sect most unjustly denied the sound part, as <sup>x</sup>St. Augustine delivers it. I would ask now, Had not the orthodox true baptism among them, because the Donatists denied it injuriously? Or should the orthodox against truth have denied baptism among the Donatists, either to cry quittance with them, or that their argument might not be the stronger because both parts granted? But mark this, how far you run

<sup>u</sup> For they are no mean differences that are between us, by Bellarmine's own confession. *Agendum est non de rebus levibus, sed de gravissimis questionibus quæ ad ipsa fidei fundamenta pertinent, &c.* Bellarm. in præfat. operibus præfixa, §. 3. And therefore the errors in them and the corruptions of them cannot be of small consequence, by your own confession. Yes, by your own indeed: for you A. C. say full as

much, if not more than Bellarmine. "Thus we catholics hold all points, in which protestants differ from us in doctrine of faith, to be fundamental and necessary to be believed, or at least not denied." A. C. Relation of the first Conference, p. 28.

<sup>x</sup> *Esse vero apud Donatistas baptismum, et illi asserunt, et nos concedimus, &c.* De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 3.

from all common principles of Christian peace, as well as Christian truth, while you deny salvation most unjustly to us, from which you are further off yourselves. Besides, if this were or could be made a concluding argument, I pray, why do not you believe with us in the point of the eucharist? for all sides agree in the faith of the church of England, that in the most blessed sacrament the worthy receiver is by his <sup>y</sup>faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real body and blood of Christ <sup>z</sup>truly, and really, and of all the benefits of his passion. Your Roman catholics add a manner of this his presence, transubstantiation, which many deny; and the Lutherans a manner of this presence, consubstantiation, which more deny. If the argument be good, then even for this consent, it is safer communicating with the church of England than with the Roman or Lutheran, because all agree in this truth, not in any other opinion. Nay, <sup>a</sup>Suarez himself, and he a very learned adversary, (what say you to this, A. C. <sup>? A. C. p. 64,</sup> doth truth force this from him?) confesses plainly, "That to <sup>65</sup>believe transubstantiation is not simply necessary to salvation;" and yet he knew well the church had determined it. And <sup>b</sup>Bellarmino, after an intricate, tedious, and almost inexplicable discourse about an adductive conversion, (a thing which neither divinity nor philosophy ever heard of till then,) is at last forced to come to this: "<sup>c</sup>Whatsoever is concerning the

<sup>y</sup> Corpus Christi manducatur in cena, &c. tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione: medium autem quo corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in cena, fides est. Eccl. Angl. Art. XXVIII.—"After a spiritual manner by faith on our behalf, and by the working of the Holy Ghost on the behalf of Christ." Fulk. in 1 Cor. xi. p. 528.—Christus seipsum omnibus bonis suis in cena offert, et nos eum recipimus fide, &c. Calv. Instit. iv. c. 17. §. 5. Et Hooker, Eccl. Pol. b. v. c. 67. §. 6.

And say not you the same with us? Spiritualis manducatio, quæ per animam fit, ad Christi carnem in sacramento pertingit. Cajet. tom. ii. Opusc. de Euchar. Tract. 2. cap. 5.—Sed spiritualiter, id est, invisibiliter, et per virtutem Spiritus Sancti. Thom. p. 3. q. 75. A. 1. ad 1.—Spiritualiter manducandus est per fidem et charitatem. Tena. in Heb. xiii. difficultate 8.

<sup>z</sup> I would have no man troubled at

the words *truly* and *really*. For that blessed sacrament, received as it ought to be, doth truly and really exhibit and apply the body and the blood of Christ to the receiver. So bishop White in his defence against T. W. P. edit. London, 1617. p. 138. And Calvin in 1 Cor. x. 3. Vere datur, &c. And again in 1 Cor. xi. 24. Neque enim mortis tantum et resurrectionis suæ beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed corpus ipsum in quo passus est, et surrexit. Concludo *realiter* (ut vulgo loquuntur), hoc est, *vere* nobis in cena datur Christi corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutarem, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Hoc totum pendet ex principiis metaphysicis et philosophicis, et ad fidei doctrinam non est necessarium. Suarez in 3. tom. Disput. 50. §. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. iii. c. 18. §. Ex his colligimus.

<sup>c</sup> Sed quidquid sit de modis loquendi, illud tenendum est, conversionem panis

Sect. 35. manner and forms of speech, *illud tenendum est*, this is to be held, that the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is substantial, but after a secret and ineffable manner, and not like in all things to any natural conversion whatsoever." Now if he had left out "conversion," and affirmed only Christ's real presence there after a mysterious and indeed an ineffable manner, no man could have spoke better. And therefore, if you will force the argument always to make that the safest way of salvation which differing parties agree on, why do you not yield to the force of the same argument in the belief of the sacrament, one of the most immediate means of salvation, where not only the most but all agree, and your own greatest clerks cannot tell what to say to the contrary?

IV.—I speak here for the force of the argument, which A. C. p. 64. certainly in itself is nothing, though by A. C. made of great account; for he says, "It is a confession of adversaries extorted by truth;" just as <sup>d</sup>Petilian the Donatist bragged in the case of baptism. But in truth it is nothing; for the syllogism which it frames is this: In point of faith and salvation it is safest for a man to take that way which the differing parties agree on. But papists and protestants (which are the differing parties) agree in this, that there is salvation possible to be found in the Roman church: therefore it is safest for a man to be and continue in the Roman church. To the minor proposition then, I observe this only, that though many learned protestants grant this, all do not. And then that proposition is not universally true, nor able to sustain the conclusion: for they do not in this all agree; nay, I doubt not but there are some protestants which can and do as stiffly and as churlishly deny them salvation as they do us: and A. C. should do well to consider, whether they do it not upon as good reason at least. But for the major proposition, namely, That in point of faith and sal-

et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi esse substantialem, sed arcanam et ineffabilem, et nullis naturalibus conversionibus per omnia similem, &c. Bellarm. in *Recognit. hujus loci*. Et vid. Sect. 38. num. III.

<sup>d</sup> Sed quia ita magnum firmamentum vanitatis vestræ in hac sententia esse

arbitramini, ut ad hoc tibi terminandam putares epistolam quo quasi recentius in animis legentium remaneret, breviter respondeo, &c. S. August. cont. Lit. Petil. lib. ii. c. 108. And here A. C. ad hoc sibi putavit terminandam collationem; sed frustra, ut apparebit, num. VI.

vation it is safest for a man to take that way which the Sect. 35. adversary confesses, or the differing parties agree on, I say that is no metaphysical principle, but a bare contingent proposition, and being indefinitely taken, may be true or false, as the matter is to which it is applied; but being taken universally is false, and not able to lead in the conclusion. Now that this proposition—In point of faith and salvation it is safest for a man to take that way which the differing parties agree on, or which the adversary confesses—hath no strength in itself, but is sometimes true and sometimes false, as the matter is about which it is conversant, is most evident. First, by reason: because consent of disagreeing parties is neither rule nor proof of truth; for Herod and Pilate, disagreeing parties enough, yet agreed against truth itself: but truth rather is or should be the rule to frame, if not to force agreement. And secondly, by the two instances <sup>e</sup>before given: for in the instance between the orthodox church then and the Donatists this proposition is most false; for it was a point of faith, and so of salvation, that they were upon, namely, the right use and administration of the sacrament of baptism. And yet, had it been safest to take up that way which the differing parts agreed on, or which the adverse part confessed, men must needs have gone with the Donatists against the church. And this must fall out as oft as any heretic will cunningly take that way against the church which the Donatists did, if this principle shall go for current. But in the second instance, concerning the eucharist, a matter of faith, and so of salvation too, the same proposition is most true. And the reason is, because here the matter is true; namely, the true and real participation of the body and blood of Christ in that blessed sacrament. But in the former the matter was false; namely, that rebaptization was necessary for baptism formally given by the church. So this proposition—In point of faith and salvation it is safest for a man to take that way which the differing parties agree in, or which the adversary confesses—is, you see, both true and false, as men have cunning to apply it, and as the matter is about which it is conversant: and is therefore no proposition able or fit to settle a conclusion in any sober

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 35. num. III.



Sect. 35. man's mind, till the matter contained under it be well scanned and examined? And yet, as much use as you would make of this proposition to amaze the weak, yourselves dare not stand to it; no, not where the matter is undeniably true, as shall appear in divers particulars beside this of the eucharist.

A. C. p. 65. V.—But before I add any other particular instances, I must tell you what A. C. says to the two former: for he tells us, “These two are nothing like the present case.” Nothing! that is strange indeed. Why, in the first of those cases concerning the Donatists your proposition is false; and so far from being safest, that it was no way safe for a man to take that way of belief, and so of salvation, which both parts agreed on. And is this nothing? nay, is not this full and home to the present case? For the present case is this, and no more, That it is safest taking that way of belief which the differing parties agree on, or which the adversary confesses. And in the second of those cases concerning the eucharist, your proposition indeed is true; not by the truth which it hath in itself metaphysically and in abstract, but only in regard of the matter to which it is applied: yet there you desert your own proposition where it is true. And is this nothing? nay, is not this also full and home to the present case, since it appears your proposition is such as yourselves dare not bide by, either when it is true or when it is false? For in the case of baptism administered by the Donatist, the proposition is false, and you dare not bide by it for truth's sake. And in the case of the eucharist the proposition is true, and yet you dare not bide by it for the church of Rome's sake. So that church (with you) cannot err, and yet will not suffer you to maintain truth; which not to do is some degree of error, and that no small one.

A. C. p. 65. VI.—Well, A. C. goes on, and gives his reasons why these two instances are nothing like the present case. “For in these cases,” saith he, “there are annexed other reasons of certainly known peril of damnable schism and heresy, which we should incur by consenting to the Donatists' denial of true baptism among catholics, and to the protestants' denial or doubting of the true substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist; but in this case of resolving to live and die in the catholic Roman church, there is confessedly no such peril of

any damnable heresy or schism, or any other sin." Here I Sect. 35.  
 have many particulars to observe upon A. C., and you shall  
 have them as briefly as I can set them down.

And first, I take A. C. at his word, that in the case of the Punct. 1.  
 Donatists, should it be followed, there would be known peril  
 of damnable schism and heresy by denying true baptism to be  
 in the orthodox church. For by this you may see what a sound  
 proposition this is, That where two parties are dissenting, it  
 is safest believing that in which both parties agree, or which  
 the adversary confesses; for here you may see by the case  
 of the Donatist is confessed, it may lead a man that will  
 universally lean to it into known and damnable schism and  
 heresy. An excellent guide, I promise you, this; is it not?

Nor, secondly, are these, though A. C. calls them so, annexed Punct. 2.  
 reasons; for he calls them so but to blanch the matter, A. C. p. 65.  
 as if they fell upon the proposition *ab extra*, accidentally,  
 and from without; whereas they are not annexed or pinned  
 on, but flow naturally out of the proposition itself. For  
 the proposition would seem to be metaphysical, and is applica-  
 ble indifferently to any common belief of dissenting parties,  
 be the point in difference what it will. Therefore if there be  
 any thing heretical, schismatical, or any way evil in the point,  
 this proposition, being neither universally nor necessarily true,  
 must needs cast him that relies upon it upon all these rocks  
 of heresy, schism, or whatever else follows the matter of the  
 proposition.

Thirdly, A. C. doth extremely ill to join these cases of the Punct. 3.  
 Donatists for baptism and the protestants for the eucharist A. C. p. 66.  
 together, as he doth. For this proposition in the first, concern-  
 ing the Donatists, leads a man (as is confessed by him-  
 self) into known and damnable schism and heresy; but, by  
 A. C.'s good leave, the latter, concerning the protestants and  
 the eucharist, nothing so. For I hope A. C. dare not say,  
 that to believe the true, <sup>f</sup>substantial presence of Christ is  
 either known or damnable schism or heresy. Now as many

f Cæterum his absurditatibus sublati-  
 tis, quicquid ad exprimendam veram  
 substantialemque corporis ac sanguinis  
 Domini communicationem, quæ sub sa-  
 cris cœnæ symbolis, fidelibus exhibetur,  
 facere potest, libenter recipio. Calv.

Inst. lib. iv. c. 17. §. 19.—In cœnæ  
 mysterio per symbola panis et vini  
 Christus vere nobis exhibetur, &c. Et  
 nos participes substantiæ ejus facti su-  
 mus. Ibid. §. 11.

Sect. 35. and as learned <sup>g</sup>protestants believe and maintain this, as do believe possibility of salvation (as before is limited) in the Roman church: therefore they, in that, not guilty of either known or damnable schism or heresy, though the Donatists were of both.

Punct. 4.  
A. C. p. 66.

Fourthly, whereas he imposes upon the protestants “the denial or doubting of the true and real presence of Christ in the eucharist,” he is a great deal more bold than true in that also; for understand them right, and they certainly neither deny nor doubt it. For as for the Lutherans, as they are commonly called, their very opinion of consubstantiation makes it known to the world, that they neither deny nor doubt of his true and real presence there; and they are protestants. And for the Calvinists, if they might be rightly understood, they also maintain a most true and real presence, though they cannot permit their judgment to be transubstantiated; and they are protestants too. And this is so known a truth that <sup>h</sup>Bellarmino confesses it; for he saith, “Protestants do often grant that the true and real body of Christ is in the eucharist.” But he adds, “That they never say (so far as he hath read) that it is there truly and really, unless they speak of the supper which shall be in heaven.” Well; first, if they grant that the true and real body of Christ is in that blessed sacrament, (as Bellarmine confesses they do, and  
A. C. p. 65. it is most true,) then A. C. is false, who charges all the protestants with denial or doubtfulness in this point. And secondly, Bellarmine himself also shews here his ignorance or his malice; ignorance, if he knew it not, malice, if he would not know it. For the Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not only believe that the true and real body of Christ is received in the eucharist, but that it is there, and that we partake of it *vere et realiter*, which are <sup>i</sup>Calvin’s own words; and yet Bellarmine boldly affirms that to his reading “no one protestant did ever affirm it.” And

<sup>g</sup> Sect. 35. num. III.

<sup>h</sup> Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. i. c. 2. §. Quinto dicit. Sacramentarii sæpe dicunt reale corpus Christi in cena adesse, sed realiter adesse nunquam dicunt, quod legerim, nisi forte loquuntur de cœna quæ fit in cœlo, &c.

And that he means to brand protest-

ants under the name of *sacramentarii* is plain. For he says the council of Trent opposed this word *realiter*, *figmento Calvinistico*, to the Calvinistical figment. Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Calv. in 1 Cor. x. 3. vere, &c. et in 1 Cor. xi. 24. realiter. Vide supra num. III.

I for my part cannot believe but Bellarmine had read Calvin, and very carefully, he doth so frequently and so mainly oppose him. Nor can that place by any art be shifted, or by any violence wrested from Calvin's true meaning of the presence of Christ in and at the blessed sacrament of the eucharist, to any supper in heaven whatsoever. But most manifest it is, that *quod legerim*, "for aught I have read," will never serve Bellarmine to excuse him: for he himself, but in the very chapter going before, quotes four places out of Calvin, in which he says expressly, that we receive in the sacrament the body and blood of Christ *vere*, truly. So Calvin says it four times, and Bellarmine quotes the places; and yet he says in the very next chapter, that never any protestant said so, to his reading. And for the church of England, nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the <sup>1</sup> eucharist, unless A. C. can make a body no body, and blood no blood, (as perhaps he can by transubstantiation,) as well as bread no bread, and wine no wine: and the church of England is protestant too. So protestants of all sorts maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the eucharist; and then, where is any known or damnable heresy here? As for the learned of those zealous men that died in this cause in queen Mary's days, they denied not the real presence simply taken, but as their opposites forced transubstantiation upon them, as if that and the real presence had been all one. Whereas all the ancient Christians ever believed the one, and none but modern and superstitious Christians believe the other, if they do believe it; for I doubt, for my part, they do not. And as for the unlearned in those times, and all times, their zeal (they holding the foundation) may eat out their ignorances and leave them safe. Now that the learned protestants in queen Mary's days did

<sup>k</sup> Bellarm. de Eucharistia, lib. i. c. 1. §. Secundo docet.

<sup>1</sup> "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper (of the Lord) only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith." Eccl. Angl. Art. XXVIII. So here is the manner of transubstantiation denied, but the body of Christ twice affirmed. And in the prayer before con-

secration thus: "Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood," &c. And again, in the second prayer, or thanksgiving after consecration, thus: "We give thee thanks, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ," &c.

Sect. 35. not deny, nay, did maintain the real presence, will manifestly appear. For when the commissioners obtruded to Jo. Frith the presence of Christ's natural body in the sacrament, and that without all figure or similitude, Jo. Frith acknowledges, " <sup>m</sup> That the inward man doth as verily receive Christ's body as the outward man receives the sacrament with his mouth." And he adds, " <sup>n</sup> That neither side ought to make it a necessary article of faith, but leave it indifferent." Nay, archbishop Cranmer comes more plainly and more home to it than Frith. " For if you understand," saith he <sup>o</sup>, " by this word *really, reipsa*; that is, in very deed and effectually; so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of his passion, is indeed and truly present, &c. But if by this word *really* you understand *corporaliter*, corporally in his natural and organical body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is contrary to the holy word of God." And so likewise bishop Ridley. Nay, bishop Ridley adds yet further, and speaks so fully to this point, as I think no man can add to his expression: and it is well if some protestants except not against it. " Both you and I," saith <sup>q</sup> he, " agree in this; that in the sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sits on the right hand of God the Father, which shall

<sup>m</sup> Jo. Fox, Martyrolog. tom. ii. London, 1597. p. 943.

<sup>n</sup> Fox, *ibid.*

<sup>o</sup> Cranmer apud Fox, *ibid.* p. 1301.

<sup>p</sup> I say *corporaliter*, corporally; for so Bellarmine hath it expressly: Quod autem corporaliter et proprie sumatur sanguis et caro, &c. probari potest omnibus argumentis, &c. Bellarm. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. 12. §. Sed tota. And I must be bold to tell you more than that this is the doctrine of the church of Rome; for I must tell you too, that Bellarmine here contradicts himself: for he that tells us here, that it can be proved by many arguments that we receive the flesh and the blood of Christ in the eucharist *corporaliter*, said as expressly before, (had he remembered it,) that though Christ be in this blessed sacrament *vere et realiter*, yet (saith he) non dicemus corporaliter, i. e. eo modo quo sua natura existunt corpora, &c. Bellarm. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. 2. §. Tertia regula. So Bellarmine here is

in a notorious contradiction: or else it will follow plainly out of him, that Christ in the sacrament is existent one way and received another, which is a gross absurdity. And that *corporaliter* was the doctrine of the church of Rome, and meant by transubstantiation, is further plain in the book called The Institution of a Christian Man, set forth by the bishops in convocation in Henry the Eighth's time, anno 1534. chap. Of the Sacrament of the Altar: the words are, " Under the form and figure of bread and wine, the very body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, &c. exhibited and received," &c. And Aquinas expresses it thus: Quia tamen substantia corporis Christi realiter non dividitur a sua quantitate dimensiva, et ab aliis accidentibus, inde est, quod ex vi realis concomitantiae est in hoc sacramento tota quantitas dimensiva corporis Christi, et omnia accidentia ejus. Thom. p. 3. q. 76. Art. 4. C.

<sup>q</sup> Apud Fox, *ibid.* p. 1598.



come from thence to judge the quick and the dead: only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being. We confess all one thing to be in the sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament by spirit and grace, &c. You make a grosser kind of being, inclosing a natural body under the shape and form of bread and wine." So far and more, bishop Ridley. And <sup>r</sup>archbishop Cranmer confesses that he was indeed of another opinion, and inclining to that of Zuinglius, till bishop Ridley convinced his judgment and settled him in this point. And for <sup>s</sup>Calvin, he comes no whit short of these, against the calumny of the Romanists on that behalf. Now after all this, with what face can A. C. say (as he doth), that protestants deny or doubt of the true and real presence of Christ in the sacrament? I cannot well tell, or am unwilling to utter.

Fifthly, whereas it is added by A. C., "That in this present case there is no peril of any damnable heresy, schism, or any other sin, in resolving to live and die in the Roman church," that is not so neither; for he that lives in the Roman church with such a resolution, is presumed to believe as that church believes. And he that doth so, I will not say is as guilty, but guilty he is more or less, of the schism which that church first caused by her corruptions, and now continues by them and her power together; and of all her damnable opinions too in point of misbelief; though perhaps A. C. will not have them called heresies, unless they have been condemned in some general council, and of all other sins also, which the doctrine and misbelief of that church leads him into. And mark it I pray. For it is one thing to live in a schismatical church, and not communicate with it in the schism, or in any false worship that attends it. For so <sup>t</sup>Elias lived among the ten tribes and was not schismatical, and after him <sup>u</sup>Elisæus. But then neither of them either countenanced the schism, or worshipped the calves in Dan or in

<sup>r</sup> Apud Fox, *ibid.* p. 1703.

<sup>s</sup> Tantum de modo quaestio est, &c. Et facessat calumnia auferri Christum a cena sua, &c. Calv. *Inst.* lib. iv. c. 17. §. 31. Veritatem Dei in qua acquiescere tuto licet, sine controversia amplectar. Pronunciat ille carnem suam esse animæ meæ cibum, saugui-

nem esse potum. Talibus alimentis animam illi meam pascendam offero. In S. cena jubet me sub symbolis panis et vini corpus et sanguinem suum sumere, manducare et bibere. Nihil dubito, quin et ipse vere porrigat: et ego recipiam. Calv. *ibid.* §. 32.

<sup>t</sup> 3 Reg. xvii. <sup>u</sup> 4 Reg. iii.

Sect. 35. Bethel. And so also, beside these prophets, did those thousands live in a schismatical church, yet <sup>x</sup>*never bowed their knee to Baal*. But it is quite another thing to live in a schismatical church, and communicate with it in the schism and in all the superstitions and corruptions which that church teaches, nay, to live and die in them. For certainly here no man can so live in a schismatical church, but, if he be of capacity enough and understand it, he must needs be a formal schismatic, or an involved one if he understand it not. And in this case the church of Rome is either far worse or more cruel than the church of Israel, even under Ahab and Jezebel, was. The synagogue indeed was corrupted a long time and in a great degree; but I do not find that this doctrine, You must sacrifice in the high places, or this, You may not go and worship at the one altar in Jerusalem, was either taught by the priests or maintained by the prophets, or enjoined the people by the sanhedrim: nay, can you shew me when any Jew, living there devoutly according to the law, was ever punished for omitting the one of these or doing the other? But the church of Rome hath solemnly decreed her errors; and erring, hath yet decreed withal that she cannot err; and imposed upon learned men disputed and improbable opinions, transubstantiation, purgatory, and forbearance of the cup in the blessed eucharist, even against the express command of our Saviour, and that for articles of faith. And to keep off disobedience, whatever the corruption be, she hath bound up her decrees upon pain of excommunication and all that follows upon it. Nay, this is not enough, unless the fagot be kindled to light them the way. This then may be enough for us to leave Rome, though the <sup>y</sup>old prophet forsook not Israel. And therefore in this present case there is peril, great peril of damnable both schism and heresy, and other sin, by living and dying in the Roman faith, tainted with so many superstitions as at this day it is, and their tyranny to boot. So that here I may answer A. C. just as <sup>z</sup>St. Augustine answered Petilian the Donatist in the fore-named case of baptism. For

<sup>x</sup> 3 Reg. xix. 18.

<sup>y</sup> 3 Reg. xiii. 11.

<sup>z</sup> Petilianus dixit, Venite ad ecclesiam populi, et aufugite traditores (ita orthodoxos tum appellavit) si cum iis-

dem perire non vultis. Nam ut facile cognoscatis quod ipsi sunt rei, de fide nostra optime judicant. Ego illorum infectos baptizo. Illi meos (quod absit) recipiunt baptizatos, quæ omnino non

when Petilian pleaded the concession of his adversaries, Sect. 35.  
 “That baptism, as the Donatists administered it, was good and lawful,” and thence inferred, (just as the Jesuit doth against me,) “that it was better for men to join with his congregation than with the church;” St. Augustine answers: “We do indeed approve among heretics baptism, but so, not as it is the baptism of heretics, but as it is the baptism of Christ. Just as we approve the baptism of adulterers, idolaters, witches; and yet not as it is theirs, but as it is Christ’s baptism. For none of these, for all their baptism, *shall inherit the kingdom of God*: and the apostle reckons heretics among them <sup>a</sup>.” And again afterwards: “It is not therefore yours,” saith <sup>b</sup>St. Augustine, “that we fear to destroy, but Christ’s; which, even among the sacrilegious, is of and in itself holy.” Now you shall see how full this comes home to our Petilianist, A. C., (for he is one of the contractors of the church of Christ to Rome, as the Donatists confined it to Afric;) and he cries out, “That a possibility of salvation is a free confession of the A. C. p. 64, adversaries, and is of force against them, and to be thought <sup>65</sup> extorted from them by force of truth itself.” I answer: I do indeed, for my part, (leaving other men free to their own judgment,) acknowledge a possibility of salvation in the Roman church; but so, as that which I grant to Romanists, is not as they are Romanists, but as they are Christians; that is, as they believe the Creed and hold the foundation, Christ himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross superstitions of the Romish church. Nor do I fear to destroy *quod ipsorum est*, that which is theirs; but yet I dare not proceed so roughly as with theirs or for theirs to deny or weaken the foundation, which is Christ’s, even among them, and which is and remains holy, even in the midst of their superstitions: and I am willing to hope there are many among them which keep within that church,

facere, si in baptismo nostro culpas aliquas agnovissent. Videte ergo quod damus, quam sanctum sit, quod destruere metuit sacrilegus inimicus. S. August. respondet: Sic approbamus in hereticis baptismum, non hereticorum, sed Christi; sicut in fornicatoribus, idololatriis, veneficis, &c. approbamus baptismum non eorum, sed Christi. Om-

nes enim isti, inter quos et hæretici sunt, sicut dicit apostolus, *regnum Dei non pessidebunt*, &c. S. August. cont. Lit. Petilianii, lib. ii. c. 108.

<sup>a</sup> Gal. v. 19, 20, 21.

<sup>b</sup> Non ergo vestrum est quod destruere metuumus, sed Christi; quod et in sacrilegis per se sanctum est. S. August. *ibid.*

Sect. 35. and yet wish the superstitions abolished which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their errors in what they know not; and which hold the foundation firm, and live accordingly; and which would have all things amended that are amiss, were it in their power. And to such I dare not deny a possibility of salvation, for that which is Christ's in them; though they hazard themselves extremely by keeping so close to that which is superstition, and in the case of images comes too near idolatry. Nor can A. C. shift this off  
 A. C. p. 66. by adding, "living and dying in the Roman church." For this "living and dying in the Roman church" (as is before expressed) cannot take away the possibility of salvation from them which believe and repent of whatsoever is error or sin in them, be it sin known to them or be it not. But then perhaps A. C. will reply, that if this be so, I must then maintain that a Donatist also, living and dying in schism, might be saved. To which I answer two ways. First, that a plain honest Donatist, having (as is confessed) true baptism, and holding the foundation, (as for aught I know the <sup>c</sup> Donatists

<sup>c</sup> For though Prateolus will make Donatus, and from him the Donatists, to be guilty of an impious heresy (I doubt he means Arianism, though he name it not) in making the Son of God less than the Father, and the Holy Ghost less than the Son, De Hæres. lib. iv. hæ. 14, yet these things are most manifest out of St. Augustine concerning them, who lived with them, both in time and place, and understood them and their tenets far better than Prateolus could.

And first, St. Augustine tells us concerning them, Ariani Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti diversas substantias esse dicunt: Donatistæ autem unam Trinitatis substantiam confitentur. So they are no Arians.

Secondly, Si aliqui eorum minorem Filium esse dixerunt quam Pater est, ejusdem tamen substantiæ non negarunt. But this is but *si aliqui*, if any. So it was doubtful, this too, though Prateolus delivers it positively.

Thirdly, Plurimi vero in iis hoc se dicunt, omnino credere de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, quod catholica credit ecclesia. Nec ipsa cum illis vertitur quæstio, sed de sola communione

infeliciter litigant, &c. De sola, only about the union with the church. Therefore they erred not in fundamental points of faith. And,

Lastly, all that can further be said against them is, that some of them, to win the Goths to them when they were powerful, said, Hoc se credere quod et illi credunt. Now the Goths (for the most) were Arians: but then, saith St. Augustine, they were but *nonnulli*, some of them. And of this some it was no more certain than *sicut audivimus*, as we have heard; St. Augustine knew it not. And then if it were true of some, yet *majorum suorum auctoritate convincuntur; quia nec Donatus ipse sic credidisse asseritur, de ejus parte se esse gloriantur.* S. August. Epist. 50. Where Prateolus is again deceived; for he says expressly, that Donatus affirmed the Son to be less than the Father: Impius ille assererat, &c. But then indeed, (and which perchance deceived Prateolus,) beside Donatus, the founder of this heresy, there was another Donatus, who succeeded Majorinus at Carthage, and he was guilty of the heresy which Prateolus mentions; Et extant scripta ejus ubi

did,) and repenting of whatever was sin in him, and would have repented of the schism, had it been known to him, might be saved. Secondly, that in this particular, the Romanist and the Donatist differ much; and that therefore it is not of necessary consequence, that if a Romanist now (upon the conditions before expressed) may be saved, therefore a Donatist heretofore might: for in regard of the schism, the Donatist was in one respect worse and in greater danger of damnation than the Romanist now is, and in another respect better and in less danger. The Donatist was in greater danger of damnation, if you consider the schism itself then; for they brake from the orthodox church without any cause given them. And here it doth not follow, if the Romanist have a possibility of salvation, therefore a Donatist hath. But if you consider the cause of the schism now, then the Donatist was in less danger of damnation than the Romanist is; because the church of Rome gave the first and the greatest cause of the schism, (as is proved <sup>d</sup>before.) And therefore here it doth not follow, that if a Donatist have possibility of salvation, therefore a Romanist hath; for a lesser offender may have that possibility of safety which a greater hath not.

And last of all; whereas A. C. adds, that “confessedly there is no such peril,” that is a most loud untruth, and an ingenuous man would never have said it. For in the same <sup>e</sup>place, where I grant a possibility of salvation in the Roman church, I presently add, that it is no secure way in regard of Roman corruptions. And A. C. cannot plead for himself, that he either knew not this, or that he overlooked it; for himself disputes against it as strongly as he can. What modesty or truth call you this? for he that confesses a possibility of salvation, doth not thereby confess no peril of damnation in the same way. Yea, but if some protestants should say there is peril of damnation to live and die in the Roman faith, their saying is nothing in comparison of the number or worth of those that say there is none. So A. C. again: “And beside, they which say it are contradicted by their own

apparet, as St. Augustine confesses, De Hæres. lib. i. hæ. 69. But then St. Augustine adds there also, nec facile in iis quisquam, that scarce any of the Donatists did so much as know

that this Donatus held that opinion, much less did they believe it themselves. S. August. *ibid.*

<sup>d</sup> Sect. 21. num. I, &c.

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 35. num. I, II.

Punct. 6.  
A. C. p. 66.



Sect. 35. more learned brethren." Here A. C. speaks very confusedly: but  
 A. C. p. 66. whether he speak of protestants or Romanists, or mixes them, the matter is not great; for as for the number and worth of men, they are no necessary concluders of truth. Not number: for who would be judged by the many? The time was when the <sup>f</sup>Arians were too many for the orthodox. Not worth simply; for that once <sup>g</sup>misled, is of all other the greatest misleader: and yet God forbid that to worth weaker men should not yield in difficult and perplexed questions; yet so as that when matters fundamental in the faith come in question, they finally rest upon a higher and clearer certainty than can be found in either number or weight of men. Besides, if you mean your own party, you have not yet proved your party more worthy for life or learning than the protestants. Prove that first, and then it will be time to tell you how worthy many of your popes have been for either life or learning. As for the rest, you may blush to say it: for all protestants unanimously agree in this, "That there is great peril of damnation for any man to live and die in the Roman persuasion;" and you are not able to produce any one protestant that ever said the contrary. And therefore that is a most notorious slander, where you say, that they which affirm  
 A. C. p. 66. this peril of damnation are contradicted by their own more learned brethren.

VII.—And thus having cleared the way against the excep-

<sup>f</sup> Ingenuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est. S. Hier. advers. Luciferian. post medium, tom. ii.—Arianorum venenum non jam portiunculam quandam, sed pene orbem totum contaminaverat, adeo ut prope cunctis Latini sermonis episcopis, partim vi, partim fraude deceptis, caligo quadam mentibus offunderetur, &c. Vin. Lirin. cont. Hæres. c. 6.—Ecclesia non parietibus consistit, sed in dogmatum veritate. Ecclesia ibi est, ubi fides vera est. Cæterum ante annos quindecim, aut viginti, parietes omnes hic ecclesiarum hæretici (de Arianis et aliis hæreticis loquitur) possidebant, &c. Ecclesia autem illic erat, ubi fides vera erat. S. Hier. in Psal. cxxxiii.—Constantius: Tantane orbis terræ pars, liberi, in te residet, ut tu solus homini impio (de Athanasio loquitur) subsidio venire, et pacem orbis ac mundi totius dirimere audeas? Liberius: Esto quod egosolus sim, non tamen

propterea causa fidei fit inferior; nam olim tres solum erant reperti, qui regis mandato resisterent, &c. Theod. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 16. dialogo inter Constant. imp. et Liberium papam. So that pope did not think multitude any great note of the true church. Ubi sunt, &c. qui ecclesiam multitudine definiunt, et parvum gregem aspernantur, &c. Greg. Naz. Orat. 25. prin. Nay, the Arians were grown to that boldness, that they objected to the catholics of that time *paucitatem*, the thinness of their number, Greg. Naz. Carn. de Vita sua, p. 24. edit. Paris. 1611.—Quum ejecti tamen essent de civitatibus, jactabant in desertis suis synagogis illud, *Multi vocati, pauci electi*. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. 10.

<sup>g</sup> Error Origenis et Tertulliani magna fuit in ecclesia Dei populi tentatio. Vin. Lirin. cont. Hæres. c. 23 et 24.

tions of A. C. to the two former instances, I will now proceed (as I <sup>h</sup>promised) to make this further appear, that A. C. and his fellows dare not stand to that ground which is here laid down, namely, “That in point of faith and salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way which the adversary confesses to be true, or whereon the differing parties agree;” and that if they do stand to it, they must be forced to maintain the church of England in many things against the church of Rome. Sect. 35.

And first, I instance in the Article of our Saviour Christ’s descent into hell. I hope the church of Rome believes this article; and withal, that hell is the place of the damned: so doth the church of England. In this then these dissenting churches agree; therefore, according to the former rule, (yea, and here in truth too,) it is safest for a man to believe this article of the Creed, as both agree; that is, that Christ descended in soul into the place of the damned. But this the Romanists will not endure at any hand; “for the school<sup>i</sup> agree in it, that the soul of Christ in the time of his death went really no further than *in limbum patrum* ;” which is not the place of the damned, but a region or quarter in the upper part of hell (as they call it), built up there by the Romanist, without license of either scripture or the primitive church. And a man would wonder how those builders *with untemper’d mortar* found light enough in that dark place to build as they have done. Punct. 1.

Secondly, I will instance in the institution of the sacrament in both kinds. That Christ instituted it so, is confessed by both churches; that the ancient churches received it so, is agreed by both churches: therefore, according to the former rule, (and here in truth too,) it is safest for a man to receive this sacrament in both kinds. And yet here this ground of A. C. must not stand for good; no, not at Rome; but to receive in one kind is enough for the laity. And the poor Bohemians<sup>k</sup> must have a dispensation, that it may be lawful Punct. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Sect. 35. num. IV.

<sup>i</sup> Sequuntur enim Thom. p. 3. q. 52. Art. 2. c. Verba ejus sunt. Anima Christi per suam essentiam descendit solum ad locum inferni, in quo justii detinebantur, &c.

<sup>j</sup> Ezech. xiii. 10.

<sup>k</sup> Basiliense concilium concessit Bohemis utriusque speciei usum: modo fateantur id sibi concedi ab ecclesia, non autem ad hoc teneri divino jure. Bellarm. de Sacrament. in genere, lib. i. c. 2. §. 2.

Sect. 35. for them to receive the sacrament as Christ commanded them. And this must not be granted to them neither, unless they will acknowledge (most opposite to truth) that they are not bound by divine law to receive it in both kinds. And here their building with untempered mortar appears most manifestly: for they have no show to maintain this but the fiction of Thomas of Aquin, "That he which receives the body of Christ receives also his blood *per concomitantiam*, by concomitancy; because the blood goes always with the body:" of which term <sup>1</sup>Thomas was the first author I can yet find. First then, if this be true, I hope Christ knew it; and then, why did he so unusefully institute it in both kinds? Next, if this be true, concomitancy accompanies the priest as well as the people; and then, why may not he receive it in one kind also? Thirdly, this is apparently not true: for the eucharist is a sacrament *sanguinis effusi*, of blood shed and poured out; and blood poured out, and so severed from the body, goes not along with the body *per concomitantiam*. And yet Christ must rather err, or proceed I know not how in the institution of the sacrament in both kinds, rather than the holy, unerring church of Rome may do amiss in the determination for it and the administration of it in one kind. Nor will the distinction, "That Christ instituted this as a sacrifice, to which both kinds were necessary," serve the turn: for suppose that true, yet he instituted it as a sacrament also, or else that sacrament had no institution from Christ; which I suppose A. C. dares not affirm. And that institution which the sacrament had from Christ was in both kinds.

Punct. 3. And since here is mention happened of sacrifice, my third instance shall be in the sacrifice which is offered up to God in that great and high mystery of our redemption by the death of Christ. For as Christ offered up <sup>m</sup>himself once for

<sup>1</sup> Thom. p. 3. q. 76. Art. 2. C. et alibi passim.

<sup>m</sup> Christ, by his own blood, entered once into the holy place, and obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. ix. 12. And this was done by way of sacrifice, by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once made, Heb. x. 10. Christ gave himself for us, to be an offering and a sacrifice of a sweetsmelling savour unto God, Ephes. v. 2. Out of

which place the school infers, *Passionem Christi verum sacrificium fuisse*. Thom. p. 3. q. 48. Art. 3. C.—"Christ did suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; and made there, by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Eccles. Angl in Canone Consecrationis Eucharist.

all, a full and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, so did he institute and command a "memory of this sacrifice in a sacrament, even till his coming again. For at and in the eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices: one by the priest only; that is the <sup>o</sup>commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out; another by the Priest and the people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ; the third, <sup>a</sup>by every particular man for himself only; and that is

Sect. 35.

<sup>n</sup> "And Christ did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again." Eccles. Angl. Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> Sacramentum hoc est commemorativum Dominicæ passionis, quæ fuit verum sacrificium; et sic nominatur sacrificium. Thom. p. 3. q. 73. Art. 4. C. —"Christ being offered up once for all in his own proper person, is yet said to be offered up, &c. in the celebration of the sacrament; because his oblation once for ever made is thereby represented." Lambert in Fox his Martyrology, vol. ii. edit. Lond. 1579. p. 1033.—Et postea. "It is a memorial or representation thereof." Ibid. The master of the sentences judged truly in this point, saying, "That which is offered and consecrated of the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory and representation of the true sacrifice and holy oblation made on the altar of the cross." Archbishop Cranmer, in his Answer to Bishop Gardiner, concerning the most holy Sacrament, lib. v. p. 377. And again, this shortly is the mind of Lombardus, "That the thing which is done at God's board is a sacrifice, and so is that also which was made upon the cross, but not after one manner of understanding: for this was the thing indeed, and that is the commemoration of the thing." Ibid. So likewise bishop Jewel acknowledgeth *invenientum et rationabile sacrificium*, spoken of by Eusebius de Demonstrat. Evang. lib. i. Jewel's Reply against Harding, Art. 7. Divis. 9. Again, the ministration of the holy communion is sometimes of the ancient Fathers called an unbloody sacrifice; not in respect of any corporal or fleshly presence that is imagined to be there without blood-shedding, but for that it representeth and reporteth

to our minds that one and everlasting sacrifice that Christ made in his body upon the cross. This bishop Jewel disliketh not in his Answer to Harding, Art. 17. Divis. 14. Patres cenam Dominicam duplici de causa vocarunt sacrificium invenientum. Tum quod sit imago et sollemnis representatio illius sacrificii *λαστικοῦ* quod Christus cum sanguinis effusione obtulit in cruce: tum quod sit etiam eucharisticum sacrificium, id est, sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis, cum pro beneficiis omnibus, tum pro redemptione imprimis per Christi mortem peracta. Zanch. in 2. Præcept. Decal. tom. iv. pag. 459. And Dr. Fulk also acknowledges a sacrifice in the eucharist, in St. Matth. xxvi. 26. Non dissimulaverint Christiani in cœna Domini, sive ut ipsi loquebantur, in sacrificio altaris peculiari quodam modo præsentem se venerari Deum Christianorum, sed quæ esset forma ejus sacrificii quod per symbola panis et vini peragitur, hoc veteres præse non ferebant. Isa. Casaub. Exercit. 16. ad Annal. Baron. §. 43. p. 560.

<sup>p</sup> In the Liturgy of the church of England, we pray to God, immediately after the reception of the sacrament, that he would be pleased to accept this our "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," &c. And Heb. xiii. 15. "The sacrifice propitiatory was made by Christ himself only, but the sacrifice commemorative and gratulatory is made by the priest and the people." Archbishop Cranmer in his Answer to Bishop Gardiner, lib. v. p. 377.

<sup>q</sup> *I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you give up your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God.* Rom. xii. 1.—"We offer, and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice

Sect. 35. the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve him in both all the rest of his life for this blessing thus bestowed on him. Now thus far these dissenting churches agree, that in the eucharist there is a sacrifice of duty, and a sacrifice of praise, and a sacrifice of commemoration of Christ. Therefore, according to the former rule, (and here in truth too,) it is safest for a man to believe the commemorative, the praising, and the performing sacrifice; and to offer them duly to God, and leave the church of Rome in this particular to her superstitions, that I may say no more. And would the church of Rome stand to A. C.'s rule, and believe dissenting parties where they agree, were it but in this and that before of the real presence, it would work far toward the peace of Christendom. But the truth is, they pretend the peace of Christendom, but care no more for it, than as it may uphold at least, if not increase their own greatness.

Punct. 4. My fourth instance shall be in the sacrament of baptism, and the things required as necessary to make it effectual to the receiver. They, in the common received doctrine of the church of Rome, are three; the matter, the form, and the intention of the priest to do that which the church doth and intends he should do. Now all other divines, as well ancient as modern, and both the dissenting churches also, agree in the two former; but many deny that the intention of the priest is necessary. Will A. C. hold his rule, "That it is safest to believe, in a controverted point of faith, that which the dissenting parties agree on, or which the adverse part confesses?" If he will not, then why should he press that as a rule to direct others, which he will not be guided by himself? And if he will, then he must go professedly against the council of Trent, which hath determined it as *de fide*, as a point of faith, that the intention of the priest is necessary to make the baptism true and valid. Though in the history<sup>s</sup> of that council, it is most apparent the bishops and other divines there could not tell what to answer to the bishop of Minors, a Neapolitan, who declared his judgment openly against it in the face of that council.

unto thee." So the Church of England, in the prayer after the receiving of the blessed sacrament.

<sup>r</sup> Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 11.  
<sup>s</sup> Hist. Concil. Trid. lib. ii. p. 277.  
 edit. Lat. Leydæ, 1622.



My fifth instance is, We say, and can easily prove, there are divers errors, and some gross ones, in the Roman Missal. But I myself have heard some Jesuits confess, that in the Liturgy of the church of England there is no positive error; and being pressed why then they refused to come to our churches, and serve God with us, they answered, they could not do it, because, though our Liturgy had in it nothing ill, yet it wanted a great deal of that which was good and was in their service. Now here let A. C. consider again, here is a plain concession of the adverse part; and both agree there is nothing in our service but that which is holy and good. What will the Jesuit or A. C. say to this? If he forsake his ground, then it is not safest in point of divine worship to join faith, as the dissenting parties agree, or to stand to the adversaries' own confession: if he be so hardy as to maintain it, then the English Liturgy is better and safer to worship God by than the Roman mass; which yet, I presume, A. C. will not confess.

VIII.—In all these instances (the matter so falling out of itself, for the argument enforces it not) the thing is true; but not therefore true, because the dissenting parties agree in it, or because the adverse part confesses it: yet lest the Jesuit, or A. C. for him, further to deceive the weak, should infer that this rule in so many instances is true, and false in none, but that one concerning baptism among the Donatists, and therefore the argument is true *ut plerumque*, as for the most, and that therefore it is the safest way to believe that which dissenting parties agree on; I will lay down some other particulars of as great consequence as any can be in or about Christian religion. And if in them A. C. or any Jesuit dare say, that it is safest to believe as the dissenting parties agree, or as the adverse party confesses, I dare say he shall be an heretic in the highest degree, if not an infidel.

And first, where the question was betwixt the orthodox and the Arian, whether the Son of God were consubstantiated with the Father: the orthodox said he was *ὁμοούσιος*, of the same substance; the Arian came within a letter of the truth, and said he was *ὁμοιούσιος*, of like substance: now he that says he is of the same substance, confesses he is of like substance and more, that is, identity of substance; for iden-

- Sect. 35. tity contains in it all degrees of likeness, and more : but he that acknowledges and believes that he is of like nature and no more, denies the identity. Therefore if this rule be true, "That it is safest to believe that in which the dissenting parties agree, or which the adverse part confesses," (which
- A. C. p. 64, 65. A. C. makes such great vaunt of,) then it is safest for a Christian to believe that Christ is of like nature with God the Father, and be free from belief that he is consubstantial with him; which yet is concluded by the council of Nice as necessary to salvation, and the contrary condemned for damnable heresy.
- Punct. 2. Secondly, in the question about the resurrection, between the orthodox and divers gross <sup>u</sup>heretics of old, and the anabaptists and libertines of late. For all or most of these dissenting parties agree, that there ought to be a resurrection from sin to a state of grace; and that this resurrection only is meant in divers passages of holy scripture, together with the life of the soul, which they are content to say is immortal; but <sup>x</sup>they utterly deny any resurrection of the body after death: so with them that article of the Creed is gone. Now then, if any man will guide his faith by this rule of A. C., the consent of dissenting parties, or the confession of the adverse part, he must deny the resurrection of the body from the grave to glory, and believe none but that of the soul from sin to grace, which the adversaries confess, and in which the dissenting parties agree.
- Punct. 3. Thirdly, in the great dispute of all others about the unity of the Godhead: all dissenting parties, Jew, Turk, and Christian; among Christians orthodox and antitrinitarian of old; and in these latter times, orthodox and Socinian, (that horrid and mighty monster of all heresies;) agree in this, that there is but one God. And I hope it is as necessary to believe one God our Father, as one church our mother. Now will

<sup>t</sup> Concil. Nicæn Fides vel Symbolum in fine Concil.

<sup>u</sup> Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Valentinus, Cerdon, Apelles, &c. Tertull. de Præscript. advers. Hæret. c. 46, 48, 49, 51, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Libertini rident spem omnem quam de resurrectione habemus, idque jam nobis evenisse dicunt, quod adhuc ex-

pectamus, &c. ut homo sciat animam suam spiritum immortalem esse perpetuo viventem in cœlis, &c. Calv. Instructione advers. Libertinos, c. 22. princ.—Sunt etiam hodie libertini qui eam irrident, et resurrectionem quæ tractatur in scripturis, tantum ad animas referunt. Pet. Mart. Loc. Com. Class. 3. cap. 15. num. 4.

A. C. say here it is safest believing as the dissenting parties Sect. 35. agree, or as the adverse parties confess, namely, that there is but one God, and so deny the Trinity, and therewith the Son of God the Saviour of the world?

Fourthly, in a point as fundamental in the faith as this; Punct. 4. namely, whether Christ be true and very God. For which very point most of the <sup>y</sup>martyrs in the primitive church laid down their lives. The dissenting parties here were the orthodox believers, who affirm he is both God and man; for so our Creed teaches us: and all those heretics, which affirm Christ to be man, but deny him to be God; as the <sup>z</sup>Arians, and <sup>a</sup>Carpoerations, and <sup>b</sup>Cerinthus, and <sup>c</sup>Hebion, with others; and at this day the <sup>d</sup>Socinians. These dissenting parties agree fully and clearly that Christ is man. Well then, dare A. C. stick to his rule here, and say, it is safest for a Christian, in this great point of faith, to govern his belief by “the consent of these dissenting parties,” or “the confession and acknowledgment of the adverse party;” and so settle his belief that Christ is a mere man, and not God? I hope he dares not. So then this rule, “To resolve a man’s faith into that in which the dissenting parties agree, or which the adverse part confesses,” is as often false as true; and false in as great, if not greater matters, than those in which it is true. And where it is true, A. C. and his fellows dare not govern themselves by it, the church of Rome condemning those things which that rule proves. And yet while they talk of certainty, nay, of infallibility, (less will not serve their turns,) they are driven to make use of such poor shifts as these, which have no certainty at all of truth in them, but infer falsehood and truth alike. And yet for this also men will be so weak or so wilful as to be seduced by them.

IX.—I told you <sup>e</sup>before, that the force of the preceding argument lies upon two things: the one expressed, and that

<sup>y</sup> Heb. xi. 37. Cyrillus Alexandrinus male audivit, quod Ammonium martyrem appellavit, quem constitit temeritatis pœnas dedisse, et non necessitate negandi Christi in tormentis esse mortuum. Soer. Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. c. 14.

<sup>z</sup> Optatus, lib. iv. cont. Parmen.

<sup>a</sup> Tertul. lib. de Præscript. c. 48.

<sup>b</sup> Tertul. *ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> Tertul. lib. de Carne Christi, c. 14.

<sup>d</sup> Si ad Jesu Christi respicias essentiam atque naturam, non nisi hominem eum fuisse constanter affirmamus. Volkelius, lib. iii. de Religione Christiana, c. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 35. num. II. fine.

Sect. 35. is past; the other upon the by, which comes now to be handled. And that is your continual poor outcry against us, "That we cannot be saved, because we are out of the church." Sure, if I thought I were out, I would get in as fast as I could. For we confess, as well as you, that "out of the catholic church of Christ there is no salvation." But what do you mean by "out of the church?" Sure out of the Roman church. Why, but the Roman church and the church of England are but two distinct members of that catholic church which is spread over the face of the earth. Therefore Rome is not the house where the church dwells, but Rome itself, as well as other particular churches, dwells in this great universal house; unless you will shut up the church in Rome, as the Donatist did in Afric. I come a little lower: Rome and other national churches are in this universal catholic house as so many daughters, to whom (under Christ) the care of the household is committed by God the Father, and the catholic church the mother of all Christians. Rome, as an elder sister, but not the eldest neither,

f Extra ecclesiam neminem vivificat Spiritus Sanctus. S. August. Epist. 50. ad finem. Field. de Eccles. lib. i. c. 13.—Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia extra quam nullus salvatur. Conc. Lateran. Can. 1. And yet even there, there is no mention of the Roman church.

g And so doth A. C. too, "Out of the catholic Roman church there is no possibility of salvation." A. C. p. 65.

h And daughter Zion was God's own phrase of old of the church, Isa. i. 8. οὐ γὰρ περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοῦτον τὸν λόγον προσηφάνηεν οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς Σιών τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Hypopol. Orat. de Consum. Mundi.—Et omnis ecclesia virgo appellata est. S. August. Tract. 13 in S. Joh.

i For Christ was to be preached to all nations, but that preaching was to begin at Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 47, according to the prophecy, Mic. iv. 2. And the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, Acts xi. 26. And therefore there was a church there before ever St. Peter came thence to settle one at Rome. Nor is it an opinion destitute either of authority or probability, that the faith of Christ was preached and the sacraments adminis-

tered here in England, before any settlement of a church in Rome. For St. Gildas, the ancientest monument we have, and whom the Romanists themselves reverence, says expressly, that the religion of Christ was received in Britany, tempore (ut scimus) summo Tiberii Cæsaris, &c. in the latter time of Tiberius Cæsar, Gildas de Excid. Brit.; whereas St. Peter kept in Jewry long after Tiberius his death. Therefore the first conversion of this island to the faith was not by St. Peter; nor from Rome, which was not then a church. Against this Rich. Broughton, in his Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, centur. 1. c. 8. §. 4, says expressly, "That the protestants do freely acknowledge, that this clause of the time of Tiberius (tempore summo Tiberii Cæsaris) is wanting in other copies of that holy writer, and namely, in that which was set forth by Pol. Virgil and others." Whereas first these words are express in a most fair and ancient manuscript of Gildas, to be seen in sir Rob. Cotton's study, if any doubt it. Secondly, these words are as express in the printed edition of Gildas by Polyd. Virg., which edition was printed at London, anno 1525, and was never re-

had a great care committed unto her, in and from the prime Sect. 35. times of the church, and to her bishop in her: but at this time (to let pass many brawls that have formerly been in the house) England, and some other sisters of hers, are fallen out in the family. What then? Will the Father and the mother, God and the church, cast one child out because another is angry with it? Or when did Christ give that power to an elder sister, that she and her steward, the bishop there, should thrust out what child she pleased? especially when she herself is justly accused to have given the offence that is taken in the house. Or will not both Father and mother be sharper to her, for this unjust and unnatural usage of her younger sisters, but their dear children? Nay, is it not the next way to make them turn her out of doors, that is so unnatural to the rest? It is well for all Christian men and churches, that the Father and mother of them are not so cursed as some would have them. And salvation need not be feared of any dutiful child, nor outing from the church, because this elder sister's faults are discovered in the house, and she grown froward for it against them that complained. But as children cry when they are waked out of sleep, so do you, and wrangle with all that come near you. And <sup>k</sup>Stapleton confesses, "That ye were in a dead sleep and overmuch rest, when the protestants stole upon you." Now if you can prove that Rome is properly the <sup>l</sup>catholic church itself, (as

printed since. Thirdly, these words are as express in the edition of Gildas by Joh. Joseline, printed at London also, anno 1568. And this falsehood of Broughton is so much the more foul, because he boasts (Prefat. to his Reader, fine), "That he hath seen and diligently perused the most and best monuments and antiquities extant," &c. For if he did not see and peruse these, he is vainly false to say it: if he did see them, he is most maliciously false to belie them. And lastly, whereas he says the protestants themselves confess so much, I must believe he <sup>c</sup>is as false in this as in the former, till he name the protestants to me which do confess it. And when he doth, he shall gain but this from me, that those protestants which confessed it were mistaken. For the thing is mistaken.

<sup>k</sup> Return of Untruths upon Mr.

Jewel, Art. 4. Untruth 105.

<sup>l</sup> For I am sure there is a Roman church that is but a particular. Belarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. c. 4. And then you must either shew me another Roman church which is the catholic, or you must shew how one and the same Roman church is in different respects or relations a particular, and yet the catholic. Which is not yet done. And I do not say, *a particular*, and yet *a catholic*; but *a particular*, and yet *the catholic* church. For so you speak. For that which card. Peron hath, that the Roman church is the catholic causally, because it infuses universality into all the whole body of the catholic church, can, I think, satisfy no man that reads it; that a particular should infuse universality into an universal. Peron's Reply, lib. iv. c. 9.



Sect. 35, 36. you commonly call it,) speak out and prove it. In the mean time you may mark this too, if you will, and it seems you do; for here you forget not what the bishop said to you.

℞. The lady which doubted (said the bishop to me) may be better saved in it than you.

Sect. 36. ℞. I said so indeed. Mark that too. Where yet by the way these words, “than you,” do not suppose person only. For I will judge <sup>m</sup>no man that hath another master to stand or fall to. But they suppose calling and sufficiency in the person. “Than you,” that is, “than any man of your calling and knowledge,” of whom more is required. And then no question of the truth of this speech, “that that person may better be saved,” that is, easier, “than you,” than any man that knows so much of truth, and opposes against it, as you, and others of your calling do. How far you know truth, other men may judge by your proofs, and causes of knowledge; but how far you oppose truth known to you, that is within, and no man can know but God and yourselves. Howsoever, where the foundation is but held, “there for <sup>n</sup>ordinary men, it is not the vivacity of understanding, but the simplicity of believing, that makes them safe.” For St. Augustine speaks there of men in the church; and no <sup>o</sup>man can be said simply to be out of the visible church, that is baptized, and holds the foundation. And as it is the simplicity of believing that makes them safe, yea, safest, so is it sometimes a quickness of understanding, that, loving itself and some by-respects too well, makes men take up an unsafe

<sup>m</sup> Rom. xiv. 4.

<sup>n</sup> Cateram turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit. S. August. cont. Fund. c. 4.—Σώζει πολλάκις τὸν λαὸν τὸ ἀβασάνιστον, Naz. Orat. 21.; omission of inquiry many times saves the people.

<sup>o</sup> “Heretics in respect of the profession of sundry divine verities, which they still retain in common with right believers, &c. do still pertain to the church.” Field, de Eccles. lib. i. c. 14.—Potest aliquis ecclesie membrum esse secundum quid, qui tamen simpliciter non est. Hæreticus recedens a fide non dimittitur ut paganus, sed propter baptismi characterem punitur ut transfuga,

et excommunicationis gladio spiritualiter occiditur. Stapl. Controv. 1. q. 2. Art. 3. Notabil. 3.

“The apostle pronounces some gone out, St. John ii. 19, from the fellowship of sound believers, when as yet the Christian religion they had not utterly cast off. In like sense and meaning, throughout all ages, heretics have justly been hated, as branches cut off from the true vine; yet only so far forth cut off as the heresies have extended. For both heresy, and many other crimes which wholly sever from God do sever from the church of God but in part only.” Hooker’s Eccles. Pol. b. v. §. 68.

way about the faith. So that there is no question but many Sect. 36. were saved in corrupted times of the church, when their “<sup>p</sup>leaders, unless they repented before death, were lost.” And <sup>q</sup>St. Augustine’s rule will be true, that in all corruptions of the church, “there will ever be a difference between an heretic, and a plain well-meaning man that is misled and believes an heretic.” Yet here let me add this for fuller expression: this must be understood of such leaders and heretics as <sup>r</sup>refuse to hear the church’s instruction, or to use all the means they can to come to the knowledge of the truth. For else, if they do this, err they may, but heretics they are not, as is most manifest in <sup>s</sup>St. Cyprian’s case of re-baptization. For here, though he were a main leader in that error, yet all the whole church grant him safe, and his <sup>t</sup>followers in danger of damnation. But if any man be a leader, and a teaching heretic, and will add <sup>u</sup>schism to heresy, and be obstinate in both; he, without repentance, must needs be lost, while many that succeed him in the error only, without the obstinacy, may be saved: for they which are misled, and swayed with the current of the time, hold the same errors with their misleaders, yet not supinely, but with all sober diligence to find out the truth; not pertinaciously, but with all readiness to submit to truth so soon as it shall be found; not uncharitably, but retaining an internal communion with the whole visible church of Christ in the fundamental points of faith, and the performance of acts of charity; not factiously, but with an earnest desire and a sincere endeavour (as their place and calling gives them means) for a perfect union and communion of all Christians in truth as well as peace. I say,

<sup>p</sup> *Ipsis magistris pereuntibus; nisi forte ante mortem resipuerint.* Luth. de Serv. Arbit.

<sup>q</sup> *Hæresiarchæ plus peccant, quam alii qui hæresin aliquam sunt secuti.* Supplem. Tho. 99. A. 4. C.

<sup>r</sup> *Si mihi videretur unus et idem hæreticus et hæreticis credens homo,* &c. S. August. de Util. Cred. lib. i. c. 1. et Epist. 162. ad Donatist. Episc.

<sup>s</sup> *S. Matt. xviii. 17. Qui oppugnant regulam veritatis.* S. August. lib. de Hæresibus, veris finem.

<sup>t</sup> *Cyprianus beatus, et martyr.* S. August. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 18.

<sup>u</sup> *Donatistæ vero (qui de Cypriani autoritate sibi carnaliter blandiuntur,* S. August. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 18.) *nimum miseri, et, nisi se corrigant, a semetipsis omnino damnati, qui hoc in tanto viro eligunt imitari.* Ibid. c. 19.

<sup>v</sup> *Rei falsitatis (circa accusatum Cæcilianum) deprehensi Donatistæ, pertinaci dissensione firmata, schisma in hæresin veterunt.* S. August. lib. de Hæres. hæ. 69.—*Et tales, sub vocabulo Christiano, doctrinæ resistunt Christianæ.* S. August. de Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. c. 51. prin.

Sect. 36, 37. these, however misled, are neither heretics nor schismatics in the sight of God, and are therefore in a state of salvation. And were not this true divinity, it would go very hard with many poor Christian souls, that have been and are misled on all sides, in these and other distracted times of the church of Christ; whereas, thus habituated in themselves, they are, by God's mercy, safe in the midst of those waves in which their misleaders perish. I pray you mark this; and so, by God's grace, will I: for our <sup>x</sup>reckoning will be heavier, if we thus mislead on either side, than theirs that follow us. But I see I must look to myself, for you are secure; for,

ƒ. Dr. White (said I) hath secured me, that none of our errors be damnable, so long as we hold them not against our conscience. And I hold none against my conscience.

Sect. 37. B.—I. It seems then you have two securities, Dr. White's assertion and your conscience. What assurance Dr. White gave you I cannot tell of myself; nor, as things stand, may I rest upon your relation. It may be you use him no better than you do me. And sure it is so; for I have since spoken with Dr. White, the late reverend bishop of Ely, and he avows this, and no other answer. He was asked, in the conference between you, whether popish errors were fundamental. To this he gave an answer, by distinction of the persons which held and professed the errors; namely, that the errors were fundamental *reductive*, by a reducement, if they which embraced them did pertinaciously adhere to them, having sufficient means to be better informed. Nay, further, that they were materially, and in the very kind and nature of them, *leaven, dross, hay, and stubble*. Yet he thought withal that such as were misled by education, or long custom, or overvaluing the sovereignty of the Roman church, and did in simplicity of heart embrace them, might by their general repentance and faith in the merit of Christ, attended with charity and other virtues, find mercy at God's hands. But that he should say *signanter*, and expressly, That none either

<sup>x</sup> Qui etsi ipsi postmodum ad ecclesiam redeunt, restituere tamen eos, et secum revocare non possunt, qui ab illis seducti sunt, et foris morte præventi extra ecclesiam sine communicatione et

pace perierunt, quorum animæ in die judicii de ipsorum manibus expetentur, qui perditionis authores et duces exstiterunt. S. Cypr. lib. ii. epist. 1.

<sup>y</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 12.

of yours or your fellows' errors were damnable, so long as you Sect. 37.  
hold them not against conscience, that he utterly disavows.  
You delivered nothing to extort such a confession from him :  
and for yourself, he could observe but small love of truth, few  
signs of grace in you, (as he told me :) yet he will not presume  
to judge you, or your salvation ; *it is the sword of Christ*  
*that must judge you at the latter day.* For your conscience,  
you are the happier in your error that you hold nothing  
against it ; especially if you speak not against it while you  
say so. But this no man can know but yourself ; <sup>a</sup>*for no*  
*man knows the thoughts of a man, but the spirit of a man that is*  
*within him :* to which I leave you.

II.—To this A. C. replies. And first he grants, “ that Dr. A. C. p. 67.  
White did not *signanter* and expressly say these precise  
words. So then here is his plain confession : “ not these precise  
words.” Secondly, he saith, “ that neither did Dr. White *sig-*  
*nanter* and expressly make the answer above mentioned.” But  
to this I can make no answer, since I was not present at the  
first or second conference. Thirdly, he saith, “ that the reason  
which moved the Jesuit to say Dr. White had secured him,  
was because the said doctor had granted, in his first confer-  
ence with the Jesuit, these things following : first, that there  
must be one or other church continually visible.” Though Dr.  
White, late bishop of Ely, was more able to answer for him-  
self, yet since he is now dead, and is thus drawn into this  
discourse, I shall, as well as I can, do him the right which  
his learning and pains for the church deserved. And to this  
first, I grant, as well as he, “ that there must be some one  
church or other continually visible :” or that the militant  
church of Christ must always be visible in some particulars,  
or particular at least, (express it as you please.) For if this  
be not so, then there may be a time in which there shall not  
anywhere be a visible profession of the name of Christ ;  
which is contrary to the whole scope and promise of the  
gospel.

III.—Well, what then ? Why then A. C. adds, “ that Dr. A. C. p. 67.  
White confessed, that this visible church had in all ages  
taught that unchanged faith of Christ in all points funda-  
mental.” Dr. White had reason to say that the visible church

<sup>z</sup> Joh. xii. 48.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 11.

Sect. 37. taught so ; but that this or that particular visible church did so teach, sure Dr. White affirmed not, unless in case the whole visible church of Christ were reduced to one particular only.

A. C. p. 67. IV.—But suppose this ; what then ? Why then A. C. tells us, that “ Dr. White being urged to assign such a church, expressly granted he could assign none different from the Roman, which held, in all ages, all points fundamental.” Now here I would fain know what A. C. means by “ a church different from the Roman.” For if he mean different in place, it is easy to affirm the Greek church, which (as hath <sup>b</sup> before been proved) hath ever held and taught the foundation in the midst of all her pressures. And if he mean different in doctrinal things, and those about the faith, he cannot assign the church of Rome for holding them in all ages. But if he mean different in the foundation itself, the Creed, then his urging to assign a church is void, be it Rome. or any other : for if any other church shall thus differ from Rome, or Rome from itself, as to deny this foundation, it doth not, it cannot remain a differing church, *sed transit in non ecclesiam*, but passes away into no church, upon the denial of the Creed.

V.—Now what A. C. means, he expresses not, nor can I tell ; but I may, peradventure, guess near it, by that which  
A. C. p. 67. out of these premises he would infer. For hence, he tells us, “ he gathered, that Dr. White’s opinion was, that the Roman church held and taught in all ages unchanged faith in all fundamental points, and did not in any age err in any point fundamental.” This is very well ; for A. C. confesses, he did but gather that this was Doctor White’s opinion. And what if he gathered that which grew not there, nor thence ? For suppose all the premises true, yet no cart-rope can draw this conclusion out of them : and then all A. C.’s labour is lost. For grant some one church or other must still be visible ; and grant that this visible church held all fundamentals of the faith in all ages ; and grant again, that Dr. White could not assign any church differing from the Roman that did this ; yet this will not follow, that therefore the Roman did it : and that because there is no more in the conclusion than in  
A. C. p. 67. the premises. For A. C.’s conclusion is, “ That in Dr. White’s

<sup>b</sup> Sect. 9.



opinion, the Roman church held and taught in all ages unchanged faith in all fundamental points." And so far, perhaps, the conclusion may stand, taking fundamental points in their literal sense, as they are expressed in creeds and approved councils. But then he adds: "and did not, in any age, err in any point fundamental." Now this can never follow out of the premises before laid down. For say, some one church or other may still be visible, and that visible church hold all fundamental points in all ages, and no man be able to name another church different from the church of Rome, that hath done this; yet it follows not therefore, "That the church of Rome did not err, in any age, in any point fundamental." For a church may hold the fundamental point literally, and, as long as it stays there, be without control; and yet err grossly, dangerously, nay damnably, in the exposition of it. And this is the church of Rome's case. For most true it is, it hath in all ages maintained the faith unchanged in the expression of the articles themselves; but it hath, in the exposition both of creeds and councils, quite changed and lost the sense and the meaning of some of them. So the faith is in many things changed, both for life and belief, and yet seems the same. Now that which deceives the world is, that because the bark is the same, men think this old decayed tree is as sound as it was at first, and not weather-beaten in any age. But when they can make me believe that painting is true beauty, I will believe too, that Rome is not only sound, but beautiful.

VI.—But A. C. goes on, and tells us, "That herenpon the Jesuit asked, whether errors in points not fundamental were damnable: and that Dr. White answered, They were not, unless they were held against conscience." It is true, that error in points not fundamental is the more damnable, the more it is held against conscience: but it is true too, that error in points not fundamental may be damnable to some men, though they hold it not against their conscience. As namely, when they hold an error in some dangerous points, which grate upon the foundation; and yet will neither seek the means to know the truth, nor accept and believe truth when it is known; especially being men able to judge, which, I fear, is the case of too many at this day in the Roman

Sect. 37.

A. C. p. 67.

Sect. 37. church. - Out of all which, A. C. tells us, "the Jesuit collected, A. C. p. 68. that Dr. White's opinion was, that the Roman church held all points fundamental, and only erred in points not fundamental; which he accounted not damnable, so long as he did not hold them against his conscience. And that thereupon he said Dr. White had secured him, since he held no faith different from the Roman, nor contrary to his conscience." Here again we have but A. C.'s and the Jesuit's collection; but if the Jesuit or A. C. will collect amiss, who can help it?

VII.—I have spoken before in this very paragraph to all the passages of A. C., as supposing them true, and set down what is to be answered to them in case they prove so. But now it is most apparent by Dr. White's answer, set down before <sup>c</sup> at large, that he never said, that the church of Rome erred only in points not fundamental, as A. C. would have it; but that he said the contrary; namely, "That some errors of the church were fundamental *reductive*, by a reduction, if they which embraced them did pertinaciously adhere to them, having sufficient means of information." And again expressly, "That he did not say, that none were damnable, so long as they were not held against conscience." Now where is A. C.'s collection? For if a Jesuit, or any other, may collect propositions which are not granted him, nay, contrary to those which are granted him, he may infer what he please. And he is much to blame, that will not infer a strong conclusion for himself, that may frame his own premises, say his adversary what he will. And just so doth A. C. bring in his conclusion, to secure himself of salvation, "because he holds no faith but the Roman, nor that contrary to his conscience:" presupposing it granted, that the church of Rome errs only in not fundamentals, and such errors not damnable, which is

A. C. p. 67. absolutely and clearly denied by Dr. White. To this A. C. says nothing, but "that Dr. White did not give this answer at the conference." I was not present at the conference between them, so to that I can say nothing as a witness: but I think all that knew Dr. White will believe his affirmation as soon as the Jesuit's, to say no more. And whereas A. C. p. 67. A. C. refers to the relation of the conference between Dr.

White and Mr. Fisher, most true it is, there <sup>d</sup>Dr. White is charged to have made the answer twice. But all this rests upon the credit of A. C. only; (for <sup>e</sup>he is said to have made that relation too, as well as this :) and against his credit I must engage Dr. White's, who hath avowed another answer, as <sup>f</sup>before is set down. Sect. 37.

VIII.—And since A. C. relates to that conference, which, it seems, he makes some good account of, I shall here, once for all, take occasion to assure the reader, that most of the points of moment in that conference with Dr. White are repeated again and again, and urged in this conference, or the relation of A. C., and are here answered by me. For instance: (1) In the relation of the first conference, the Jesuit takes on him to prove the unwritten word of God out of 2 Thes. ii., page 15. And so he doth in the relation of this conference with me, page 50. (2) In the first, he stands upon it, “That the protestants, upon their principles, cannot hold that all fundamental points of faith are contained in the Creed,” page 19. And so he doth in this, page 46. (3) In the first, he would fain, through Master Rogers his sides, wound the church of England, as if she were unsettled in the article of Christ's descent into hell, page 21. And he endeavours the same in this, page 46. (4) In the first, he is very earnest to prove, “That the schism was made by the protestants,” page 23. And he is as earnest for it in this, page 55. (5) In the first, he lays it for a ground, “That corruption of manners is no just cause of separation from faith or church,” page 24. And the same ground he lays in this, p. 55. (6) In the first, he will have it, “That the Holy Ghost gives continual and infallible assistance to the church,” page 24. And just so will he have it in this, page 53. (7) In the first, he makes much ado about the “erring of the Greek church,” page 28. And as much makes he in this, page 44. (8) In the first, he makes a great noise about the place in St. Augustine, *Ferendus est disputator errans*, &c., pages 18. and 24. And so doth he here also, page 45. (9) In the first, he would make his proselytes believe, that he and his cause have mighty ad-

<sup>d</sup> A. C. in his relation of that conference, p. 26.

<sup>e</sup> For so it is said in the title page, by A. C.

<sup>f</sup> Sect. 37. num. I.

Sect. 37. vantage by that sentence of St. Bernard, "It is intolerable pride," and that of St. Augustine, "It is insolent madness, to oppose the doctrine or practice of the catholic church," page 25. And twice he is at the same art in this, pages 56. and 73. (10) In the first he tells us, that <sup>g</sup>Calvin confesses, "that in the reformation there was a departure from the whole world," page 25. And though I conceive Calvin spake this but of the Roman world, and of no voluntary, but a forced departure, and wrote this to Melanethon, to work unity among the reformers, not any way to blast the reformation; yet we must hear of it again in this, page 56. (11) But over and above the rest, one place with his own gloss upon it pleases him extremely; it is out of Athanasius his Creed: "That whosoever doth not hold it entire; that is, saith he, "in all points, and inviolate, that is, saith he, "in the true, unchanged, and uncorrupted sense proposed unto us by the pastors of his catholic church, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." This he hath almost *verbatim* in the first, page 20. And in the epistle of the publisher of that relation to the reader, under the name of W. I., and then again the very same in this, if not with some more disadvantage to himself, page 70. And perhaps (had I leisure to search after them) more points than these. Now the reasons which moved me to set down these particulars thus distinctly are two. The one, that whereas the <sup>h</sup>Jesuit affirms, that in a second conference all the speech was about particular matters, and little or nothing about the main and great general point of a continual, infallible, visible church, in which that lady required satisfaction, and that therefore this third conference was held; it may hereby appear that the most material both points and proofs are upon the matter the very same in all the three conferences, though little be related of the second conference by A. C., as appears in the preface of the publisher, W. I., to the reader. So this tends to nothing but ostentation and show. The other is, that whereas the men boast so much of their cause and their ability to defend it; it cannot but appear by this, and their handling of other points in divinity, that they labour

<sup>g</sup> Postquam discessionem a toto mundo facere coacti sumus. Calv. set out by A. C. Epist. 141. <sup>h</sup> In the beginning of the conference

indeed, but no otherwise than like a horse in a mill, round Sect. 37, 38. about in the same circle, no further at night than at noon; the same thing over and over again; from *Tu es Petrus* to *Pasce oves*; from *Thou art Peter*, to *Do thou feed my sheep*; and back again the same way.

¶. The lady asked, whether she might be saved in the protestant faith? Upon my soul, (said the bishop,) you may. Upon my soul, (said I,) there is but one saving faith, and that is the Roman.

B. I.—So (it seems) I was confident for the faith professed Sect. 38. in the church of England, else I would not have taken the salvation of another upon my soul. And sure I had reason of this my confidence. For to believe the scripture and the creeds; to believe these in the sense of the ancient primitive church; to receive the four great general councils, so much magnified by antiquity; to believe all points of doctrine generally received as fundamental in the church of Christ, is a faith, in which to live and die cannot but give salvation. And therefore I went upon a sure ground in the adventure of my soul upon that faith. Besides, in all the points of doctrine that are controverted between us, I would fain see any one point maintained by the church of England that can be proved to depart from the foundation. You have many dangerous errors about the very foundation, in that which you call the Roman faith; but there I leave you to look to your own soul and theirs whom you seduce. Yet this is true too, that there is but one saving faith. But then every thing which you call *de fide*, of the faith, because some council or other hath defined it, is not such a breach from that one saving faith, as that he which expressly believes it not, nay, as that he which believes the contrary, is excluded from salvation, so his <sup>i</sup> disobedience therewhile offer no violence to the peace of the church, nor the charity which ought to be among Christians. And <sup>k</sup> Bellarmine is forced to grant this; “There are many things *de fide*, which are not absolutely necessary to salvation.” <sup>l</sup>Therefore there is a latitude in the faith, especially

<sup>i</sup> Sect. 32. num. V.

<sup>k</sup> Multa sunt de fide, que non sunt absolute necessaria ad salutem. Bel-

larm. de Eccles. Milit. lib. iii. c. 14. §. Quinto, si esset.

<sup>l</sup> Wald. Doct. Fid. lib. ii. Ar. 2. §. 23.



Sect. 38. in reference to different men's salvation. To set <sup>m</sup>bounds to this, and strictly to define it for particular men, just thus far you must believe in every particular, or incur damnation, is no work for my pen. These two things I am sure of. One, that your peremptory establishing of so many things, that are remote deductions from the foundation, to be believed as matters of faith necessary to salvation, hath, with other errors, lost the peace and unity of the church, for which you will one day answer. And the other, that you of Rome are gone further from the foundation of this one saving faith than can ever be proved we of the church of England have done.

II.—But here A. C. bestirs himself, finding that he is come upon the point which is indeed most considerable. And first A. C. p. 68. he answers, “That it is <sup>n</sup>not sufficient to beget a confidence in this case, to say we believe the scriptures and the Creeds in the same sense which the ancient primitive church believed them,” &c. Most true, if we only say and do not believe. And let them which believe not while they say they do, look to it on all sides; for on all sides I doubt not, but such there are. But if we do say it, you are bound in charity to believe us, (unless you can prove the contrary;) for I know no other proof to men of any point of faith, but confession of it, and subscription to it. And for these particulars we have made the one and done the other. So it is no bare saying, but you have all the proof that can be had, or that ever any church required; for how far that belief or any other sinks into a man's heart, is for none to judge but God.

A. C. p. 68. III.—Next, A. C. answers, “That if to say this be a sufficient cause of confidence, he marvels why I make such difficulty to be confident of the salvation of Roman catholics, who believe all this in a far better manner than protestants

<sup>m</sup> Sect. 38. num. VIII.

<sup>n</sup> Pope Pelagius the Second thought it was sufficient. For when the bishops of Istria deserted his communion in causa trium capitulorum, he first gives them an account of his faith, that he embraced that faith which the apostles had delivered and the four synods explicated. And then he adds: Ubi ergo de fidei firmitate nulla vobis poterit quaestio vel suspicio generari, &c. Concil. tom. iv. p. 473. edit. Paris. So then that pope thought there could be no

question made or suspicion had of any man's faith that professed that faith which the apostles delivered, as it is explicated by those great councils. And yet now with A. C. it is not sufficient. Or else he holds the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ in such respect of persons, (contrary to the apostle's rule, James ii. 12,) as that profession of it which was sufficient for pope Pelagius, shall not be sufficient for the poor protestants.

do." Truly, to say this, is not a sufficient cause, but to say Sect. 38. and believe it, is. And to take off A. C.'s wonder why I make difficulty, great difficulty, of the salvation of Roman catholics, who, he says, "believe all this, and in a far better manner than protestants do," I must be bold to tell him, that Romanists are so far from believing this in a better manner than we do, that, under favour, they believe not part of this at all. And this is most manifest; for the Romanists dare not believe but as the Roman church believes: and the Roman church at this day doth not believe the scripture and the Creeds in the sense in the which the ancient primitive church received them; for the primitive church never interpreted Christ's descent into hell to be no lower than *limbus patrum*; nor did it acknowledge a purgatory in a side-part of hell: nor did it ever interpret away half the sacrament from Christ's own institution; which to break, °Stapleton confesses expressly, is a damnable error: nor make the intention of the priest of the essence of baptism; nor believe worship due to images; nor dream of a transubstantiation, which the learned of the Roman party dare not understand properly for a change of one substance into another; for then they must grant that Christ's real and true body is made of the bread, and the bread changed into it, which is properly transubstantiation: nor yet can they express it in a credible way, as appears by P Bellarmine's struggle about it, which yet in the

° Stapleton's Return of Untruths upon Bishop Jewel, Art. 2. Untruth 49. fol. 44.

P Est totalis conversio substantiæ panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Domini. Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. iii. c. 18. §. 1.—Substantialis conversio, seu transubstantiatio, sicut ecclesia appellat. Greg. de Valen. tom. iv. Disp. 6. q. 3. punct. 3. Now you shall see what stuff Bellarmine makes of this. Conversio panis in corpus Domini, nec est productiva, nec conservativa, sed adductiva. Nam corpus Domini præexistit ante conversionem, sed non sub speciebus panis. Conversio igitur non facit, ut corpus Christi simpliciter esse incipiat, sed ut incipiat esse sub speciebus panis, &c. Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. iii. c. 18. §. Ex his colligimus.—So upon the whole matter, there shall be a total conversion of the bread into the

body of Christ; and yet there shall be no conversion at all, but a bringing of the body of Christ, before preexistent, to be now under the species of bread, where before it was not. Now this is merely *translocation*, it is not *transubstantiation*; and I would have Bellarmine, or any Jesuit for him, shew where *conversio adductiva* is read in any good author. But when Bellarmine comes to the recognition of his works, upon this place he tells us, that some excepted against him, as if this were translocation, rather than transubstantiation. So in this charge upon him I am not alone. And fain would he shift off this, but it will not be. But while he is at it he runs into two pretty errors, beside the main one; the first is, that the body of Christ in the sacrament begins to be, non ut in loco, sed ut substantia sub accidentibus. Now

Sect. 38. end cannot be or be called *transubstantiation*, and is that which at this day is a scandal to both Jew and Gentile, and the church of God.

A. C. p. 69. IV.—For all this, A. C. goes on, and tells us, “That they (of Rome) cannot be proved to depart from the foundation so much as protestants do.” So then we have at last a confession here that they may be proved to depart from the foundation, though not so much or so far as the protestants do. I do not mean to answer this, and prove that the Romanists do depart as far or further from the foundation than the protestants, for then A. C. would take me at the same lift, and say I granted a departure too. Briefly therefore I have named here more instances than one; in some of which they have erred in the foundation, or very near it. But for the church of England, let A. C. instance, if he can, in any one point in which she hath departed from the foundation. Well, A. C. p. 69. that A. C. will do; for he says, “The protestants err against the foundation by denying infallible authority to a general council, for that is in effect to deny infallibility to the whole catholic church.” †No, there is a great deal of difference between a general council and the whole body of the church. And when a general council errs, as the second of Ephesus

let Bellarmine, or A. C. for him, give me any one instance, that a bodily substance under accidents is or can be any where, and not *ut in loco*, as in some place, and he says somewhat. The second is, that some Fathers and others seem (he says, but I see it not) to approve of his manner of speech of conversion by *adduction*. And he tells us for this, that Bonaventure says expressly, In *transubstantiatione* fit, ut quod erat *alicubi*, sine sui *mutatione* sit *alibi*. Now first, here is nothing that can be drawn with cart-ropes to prove conversion by *adduction*. For if there be conversion, there must be change: and this is *sine mutatione sui*. And secondly, I would fain know how a body that is *alicubi* shall be *alibi*, without change of itself, and yet that this shall be rather *transubstantiation* than *translocation*; besides, it is a phrase of very sour consequence, (should a man squeeze it,) which Bellarmine uses there even in his *Recognition*; *Panis transit in corpus Christi*.

‡ A scandal, and a grievous one. For

this gross opinion was but confirmed in the council of Lateran: it had got some footing in the church the two blind ages before. For Berengarius was made recant in such terms as the Romanists are put to their shifts to excuse. Bellarm. de Euchar. lib. iii. c. 24. §. *Quantum argumentum*. For he says expressly, *Corpus Christi posse in sacramento sensualiter manibus sacerdotum tractari, et frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri*. Decr. de Consecratione, par. 3. Dist. 2. C. *Ego Berengarius*. Now this recantation was made about the year 1050; and the council of Lateran was in the year 1215. Between this gross recantation of Berengarius and that council, the great learned physician and philosopher Averroes lived, and took scandal at the whole body of Christian religion for this. And thus he saith; *Mundum peragravi, &c. et non vidi sectam deteriorem aut magis fatuam Christiana, quia Deum, quem colunt, dentibus devorant*. Espencaeus de Euchar. Adoratione, lib. iv. c. 3.

† Sect. 33. consid. 4. num. I.

did, out of that great catholic body another may be gathered, Sect. 38. as was then that of Chalcedon, to do the truth of Christ that right which belongs unto it. Now if it were all one in effect to say a general council can err, and that the whole church can err, there were no remedy left against a general council erring; <sup>s</sup>which is your case now at Rome, and which hath thrust the church of Christ into more straits than any one thing besides. But I know where you would be. A general council is infallible, if it be confirmed by the pope; and the pope he is infallible, else he could not make the council so. And they which deny the council's infallibility deny the pope's, which confirms it. And then indeed the protestants depart a mighty way from this great foundation of faith, the pope's infallibility. But God be thanked this is only from the foundation of the present Roman faith, (as A. C. and the A. C. p. 68. Jesuit call it,) not from any foundation of the Christian faith, to which this infallibility was ever a stranger.

V.—From answering, A. C. falls to asking questions. I think he means to try whether he can win any thing upon me by the cunning way, *a multis interrogationibus simul*, by asking many things at once, to see if any one may make me slip into a confession inconvenient. And first he asks, “How pro- A. C. p. 69. testants, admitting no infallible rule of faith but scripture only, can be infallibly sure that they believe the same entire scripture and Creed, and the four first general councils, and in the same incorrupted sense in which the primitive church believed?” It is just as I said; here are many questions in one, and I might easily be caught, would I answer in gross to them all together: but I shall go more distinctly to work. Well then, I admit no ordinary rule left in the church of divine and infallible verity, and so of faith, but the scripture. And I believe the entire scripture, first, by the tradition of the church, then by all other credible motives, as is before expressed, and last of all by the light which shines in the scripture itself, kindled in believers by the Spirit of God. Then I believe the entire scripture infallibly, and by a divine infallibility am sure of my object: then am I as sure of my believing, which is the act of my faith conversant about this object; for no man believes, but he must needs know in him-

<sup>s</sup> Sect. 33. consid. 7. num. IV.

Sect. 38. self whether he believes or no, and wherein and how far he doubts. Then I am infallibly assured of my creed, the tradition of the church inducing and the scripture confirming it. And I believe both scripture and Creed in the same uncorrupted sense which the primitive church believed them; and am sure that I do so believe them, because I cross not in my belief any thing delivered by the primitive church; and this again I am sure of, because I take the belief of the primitive church as it is expressed and delivered by the councils and ancient Fathers of those times. As for the four councils, if A. C. ask how I have them, that is, their true and entire copies, I answer, I have them from the church tradition only; and that is assurance enough for this: and so I am fully as sure as A. C. is, or can make me. But if he ask how I know infallibly I believe them in their true and uncorrupted sense, then I answer, there is no man of knowledge but he can understand the plain and simple decision expressed in the canon of the council, where it is necessary to salvation. And for all other debates in the councils, or decisions of it in things of less moment, it is not necessary that I or any man else have infallible assurance of them; though I think it is possible to attain, even in these things, as much infallible assurance of the uncorrupted sense of them as A. C. or any other Jesuits have.

A. C. p. 69. VI.—A. C. asks again, “What text of scripture tells that protestants now living do believe all this, or that all this is expressed in those particular Bibles, or in the writings of the Fathers and councils, which now are in the protestants’ hands?” Good God! whither will not a strong bias carry even a learned judgment! Why, what consequence is there in this? The scripture now is the only ordinary infallible rule of divine faith; therefore the protestants cannot believe all this before mentioned, unless a particular text of scripture can be shewed for it: is it not made plain before how we believe scripture to be scripture, and by divine and infallible faith too, and yet we can shew no particular text for it? Beside, were a text of scripture necessary, yet that is for the object and the thing which we are to believe, not for the act of our believing, which is merely from God, and in ourselves, and for which we cannot have any warrant from or by scripture more than



that we ought to believe, but not that we in our particular Sect. 38. do believe. The rest of the question is far more inconsequent, “Whether all this be expressed in the Bibles which are in protestants’ hands?” For first, we have the same Bibles in our hands which the Romanists have in theirs; therefore, either we are infallibly sure of ours, or they are not infallibly sure of theirs; for we have the same book, and delivered unto us by the same hands; and all is expressed in ours that is in theirs. Nor is it of moment in this argument that we account more apocryphal than they do; for I will acknowledge every fundamental point of faith as proveable out of the canon, as we account it, as if the apocryphal were added unto it. Secondly, A. C. is here extremely out of himself and his way, for his question is, “Whether all this be expressed in the Bibles which we have?” All this? All what? Why, before there is mention of the four general councils; and in this question here is mention of the writings of the Fathers and the councils. And what! will A. C. look that we must shew a text of scripture for all this, and an express one too! I thought, and do so still, it is enough to ground belief upon necessary consequence out of scripture, as well as upon express text. And this I am sure of, that neither I nor any man else is bound to believe any thing as necessary to salvation, be it found in councils, or Fathers, or where you will, <sup>u</sup>if it be contrary to express scripture, or necessary consequence from it. And for the copies of the councils and Fathers which are in our hands, they are the same that are in the hands of the Romanists, and delivered to posterity by tradition of the church, which is abundantly sufficient to warrant that. So we are as infallibly sure of this as it is possible for any of you to be; nay, are we not more sure? for we

<sup>t</sup> Non potest aliquid certum esse certitudine fidei, nisi aut immediate continetur in verbo Dei, aut ex verbo Dei per evidentem consequentiam deducatur. Bellarm. de Justif. lib. iii. c. 8. §. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Nec ego Nicænum, nec tu debes Ariminense tanquam præjudicaturus proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris. Scripturarum autoritatibus, &c. res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet. S. Aug. cont. Maximinum,

lib. iii. c. 14.—Testimonia divina in fundamento ponenda sunt. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. xx. c. 1.—Quia principia hujus doctrinæ per revelationem habentur, &c. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. A. 8. ad 2. Solis scripturarum libris canonicis didici hunc honorem deferre, ut nullum auctorem eorum in scribendo erasse aliquid firmissime credam. Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate, doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem, quod ipsi ita senserunt, vel scripserunt. S. August. Epist. 19.

Sect. 38. have used no *index expurgatorius* upon the writings of the Fathers<sup>x</sup>, as you have done: so that posterity hereafter must thank us for true copies both of councils and Fathers, and not you.

A. C. p. 69. VII.—But A. C. goes on, and asks still, “Whether protestants be infallibly sure that they rightly understand the sense of all which is expressed in their books, according to that which was understood by the primitive church, and the Fathers which were present at the four first general councils?” A. C. may ask everlastingly, if he will ask the same over and over again. For, I pray, wherein doth this differ from his first<sup>y</sup> question, save only that here scripture is not named? For there the question was of our assurance of the incorrupted sense: and therefore thither I refer you for answer, with this, that it is not required, either of us or of them, that there should be had an infallible assurance that we rightly understand the sense of all that is expressed in our books. And I think I may believe without sin that there are many things expressed in these books (for they are theirs as well as ours) which A. C. and his fellows have not infallible assurance that they rightly understand in the sense of the primitive church, or the Fathers present in those councils. And if they say, Yes, they can, because when a difficulty crosses them, they believe them in the church’s sense; yet that dry shift will not serve. For belief of them in the church’s sense is an implicit faith; but it works nothing distinctly upon the understanding. For by an implicit faith no man can be infallibly assured that he doth rightly understand the sense, (which is A. C.’s question,) whatever perhaps he may rightly believe. And an implicit faith and an infallible understanding of the same thing under the same considerations, cannot possibly stand together in the same man at the same time.

A. C. p. 69. VIII.—A. C. hath not done asking yet; but he would further know, “Whether protestants can be infallibly sure, that all and only those points which protestants account fundamental, and necessary to be expressly known by all, were so accounted by the primitive church?” Truly unity, in the faith is very considerable in the church. And in this the

<sup>x</sup> Sixtus Senens. in Epist. ad Pium Quintum.

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 38. num. V.

protestants agree, and as uniformly as you, and have as infallible assurance as you can have of all points which they account fundamental, yea, and of all which were so accounted by the primitive church. And these are but the Creed, and some few, and those immediate deductions from it. And <sup>z</sup>Tertullian and <sup>a</sup>Rufinus upon the very clause of the catholic church, to decipher it, make a recital only of the fundamental points of faith. And for the first of these, the Creed, you see what the sense of the primitive church was by that famous and known place of <sup>b</sup>Irenæus; where, after he had recited the Creed as the epitome or brief of the faith, he adds, “That none of the governors of the church, be they never so potent to express themselves, can say *alia ab his*, other things from these: nor none so weak in expression as to diminish this tradition. For since the faith is one and the same, he that can say much of it says no more than he ought; nor doth he diminish it that can say but little.” And in this the protestants all agree. And for the second, the immediate deductions, they are not formally fundamental for all men, but for such<sup>c</sup> as are able to make or understand them. And for others, it is enough if they do not obstinately or schismatically refuse them, after they are once revealed. Indeed you account many things fundamental, which were never so accounted in any sense by the primitive church; such as are all the decrees of general councils, which may be all true, but can never be all fundamental in the faith. For it is not in the power of <sup>d</sup>the whole church, much less of a general council, to make any thing fundamental in the faith that is not contained in the letter or sense of that common faith which was

<sup>z</sup> Tertull. Præscript. adversus Hæres. c. 13, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Rufin. in Symb.

<sup>b</sup> Et neque qui valde potens est in dicendo ex ecclesiæ præfectis alia ab his dicet, &c. Neque debilis in dicendo hanc traditionem imminuet. Quum enim una et eadem fides sit, neque is, qui multum de ea dicere potest, plusquam oportet, dicit, neque qui parum, ipsam imminuit. Irenæus, Adv. Hær. lib. i. c. 2. et 3. Et S. Basil. Sermon. de Fide, tom. ii. p. 195. edit. Basil. 1505. —Una etiam mobilis regula, &c. Tertull. de Veland. Virg. c. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Quantum ad prima credibilia, quæ sunt articuli fidei, tenetur homo expli-

cite credere, sicut et tenetur habere fidem. Quantum autem ad alia credibilia, &c. non tenetur explicite credere, nisi quando hoc ei constiterit in doctrina fidei contineri. Thom. 2. 2. q. 2. A. 5. C.—Potest quis errare credendo oppositum alicui articulo subtili, ad cuius fidem explicitam non omnes tenentur. Holkot. in 1. sent. q. 1. ad quartum.

<sup>d</sup> Resolutio Occhami est, Quod nec tota ecclesia, nec concilium generale, nec summus pontifex potest facere articulum quod non fuit articulus. Articulus enim est ex eo solo, qui a Deo revelatus est. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 15. q. unica. Concl. 4. Dub. 3.

Sect. 38. once given (and but once for all) to the saints<sup>e</sup>. But if it be A. C.'s meaning to call for an infallible assurance of all such points of faith as are decreed by general councils, then I must be bold to tell him, all those decrees are not necessary to all men's salvation. Neither do the Romanists themselves agree in all such determined points of faith, be they determined by councils or by popes. For instance: after those books (which we account apoeryphal) were <sup>f</sup>defined to be canonical, and an anathema pronounced in the case, <sup>g</sup>Sixtus Senensis makes scruple of some of them. And after <sup>h</sup>pope Leo X. had defined the pope to be above a general council, yet many Roman catholics defend the contrary; and so do all the Sorbonnists at this very day. Therefore, if these be fundamental in the faith, the Romanists differ one from another in the faith, nay, in the fundamentals of the faith, and therefore cannot have infallible assurance of them. Nor is there that unity in the faith amongst them, which they so much and so often boast of. For what scripture is canonical is a great point of faith. And I believe they will not now confess that the pope's power over a general council is a small one. And so let A. C. look to his own infallible assurance of fundamentals in the faith; for ours, God be thanked, is well. And since he is pleased to call for a particular text of scripture to prove all and every thing of this nature, which is ridiculous in itself, and unreasonable to demand, (as hath been shewed<sup>i</sup>;) yet when he shall be pleased to bring forth but a particular known tradition, to prove all and every thing of this on their side, it will then be, perhaps, time for him to call for and for us to give further answer about particular texts of scripture.

A. C. p. 69. IX.—After all this questioning, A. C. infers, "That I had need seek out some other infallible rule and means by which I may know these things infallibly; or else that I have no reason to be so confident as to adventure my soul that one may be saved living and dying in the protestant faith." How weak this inference is, will easily appear by that which I have already said to the premises: and yet I have some-

<sup>e</sup> Jude 3.

<sup>f</sup> Concil. Trid. Sess. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Six. Senens. Biblioth. Sanct. lib. i.

<sup>h</sup> Non est necessario credendum de-

terminatis per sum. pontificem, &c. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 24. q. unica. Conclus. 6. Dubit. 6. fine.

<sup>i</sup> Sect. 38. num. VI.

what left to say to this inference also. And first, I have lived, and shall, God willing, die in the faith of Christ, as it was professed in the ancient primitive church, and as it is professed in the present church of England. And for the rule which governs me herein, if I cannot be confident for my soul upon the scripture, and the primitive church expounding and declaring it, I will be confident upon no other. And secondly, I have all the reason in the world to be confident upon this rule; for this can never deceive me: another, (that very other which A. C. proposes,) namely, the faith of the Roman church, may. Therefore, with A. C.'s leave, I will venture my salvation upon the rule aforesaid, and not trouble myself to seek another of man's making, to the forsaking and weakening of this which God hath given me. For I know they *committed two evils, which forsook the fountain of living waters, to hew out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water*<sup>k</sup>. For here is the evil of desertion of that which was right, and the evil of a bad choice of that which is hewed out with much pains and care, and is after useless and unprofitable. But then, thirdly, I find that a Romanist may make use of an implicit faith at his pleasure, but a protestant must know all these things infallibly; that is A. C.'s word, "know these things." Why, but is it not enough to believe them? Now God forbid it should. Else what shall become of millions of poor Christians in the world, which cannot know all these things, much less know them infallibly? Well, I would not have A. C. weaken the belief of poor Christians in this fashion. But for things that may be known as well as believed, nor I nor any other shall need forsake the scripture, to seek another rule to direct either our conscience or our confidence.

X.—In the next place A. C. observes, "That the Jesuit was as confident for his part, with this difference, that he had sufficient reason of his confidence, but I had not for mine." This is said with the confidence of a Jesuit, but as yet, but said. Therefore he goes on, and tells us, "That the Jesuit had reason of his confidence out of express scriptures, and Fathers, and the infallible authority of the church." Now truly, express scriptures, with A. C.'s patience, he hath not named one that is express, nor can he. And the few scrip-

Sect. 38.

A. C. p. 72.

A. C. p. 69.

A. C. p. 70.

<sup>k</sup> Jer. ii. 13.



Sect. 38. tures which he hath alleged I have <sup>l</sup>answered, and so have others. As for Fathers, he hath named very few, and with what success I leave to the reader's judgment. And for the authority of the catholic church, I hold it <sup>m</sup> as infallible as he, and upon better grounds; but not so of a general council, which he here means, as appears <sup>n</sup>after. And, for my part, I must yet think (and I doubt A. C. will not be able to disprove it) that express scripture, and Fathers, and the authority of the church, will rather be found proofs to warrant my confidence than his. Yea, but A. C. saith, "That I did not then tax the Jesuit with any rashness." It may be so: nor did he me. So there we parted even. Yea, but he saith again, "That I acknowledge there is but one saving faith, and that the lady might be saved in the Roman faith, which was all the Jesuit took upon his soul." Why, but if this be all, I will confess it again. The first, that there is but one faith, I confess with St. Paul<sup>o</sup>. And the other, that the lady might be saved in the Roman faith, or church, I confess, with that charity which St. Paul teacheth me, namely, to leave all men, especially the weaker both sex and sort, which hold the foundation, to *stand or fall to their own master*<sup>q</sup>. And this is no mistaken charity. As for the inference which you would draw out of it, that is answered at large <sup>r</sup>already. But then

A. C. p. 70. A. C. adds, "That I say, but without any proof, that the Romanists have many dangerous errors; but that I neither tell them which they be, nor why I think them dangerous, but that I leave them to look to their own souls; which," he says, "they do, and have no cause to doubt." How much the Jesuit and A. C. have said in this conference without any solid proof, I again submit to judgment; as also what proofs I have made. If in this very place I have added none, it is because I had made proof enough of the selfsame thing before<sup>s</sup>. Where, lest he should want, and call for proof again, I have plainly laid together some of the many dangerous errors which are charged upon them. So I tell you which, at least some of which, they be: and their very naming will

<sup>l</sup> Sect. 25. num. V. Sect. 33. consid.  
3. num. I.

<sup>m</sup> Sect. 21. num. V.

<sup>n</sup> A. C. p. 71.

<sup>o</sup> Ephes. iv. 5.

<sup>p</sup> Sect. 35. num. I.

<sup>q</sup> Rom. xiv. 4.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 35. num. II.

<sup>s</sup> Sect. 33. num. XII. Sect. 35. num. VII.

shew their danger. And if I did remit you to look to your Sect. 38. own souls, I hope there was no offence in that, if you do it, and do it so, that you have no cause to doubt. And the reason why you doubt not, A. C. tells us, is, "Because you A. C. p. 70. had no new device of your own, or any other men's, nor any thing contrary to scripture; but all most conformable to scriptures interpreted by union, consent of Fathers, and definitions of councils." Indeed, if this were true, you had little cause to doubt in point of your belief. But the truth is, you do hold new devices of your own, which the primitive church was never acquainted with: and some of those, so far from being conformable, as that they are little less than contradictory to scripture. In which particulars, and divers others, the scriptures are not interpreted by union, or consent of Fathers, or definitions of councils; unless perhaps by some late councils packed of purpose to do that ill service. I have given instances enough <sup>u</sup>before; yet some you shall have here, lest you should say again that I affirm without proof or instance. I <sup>x</sup> pray then, whose device was transubstantiation? <sup>y</sup>And whose, communion under one kind? <sup>z</sup>And whose, deposition and unthroning, nay, killing of princes, and the like, if they were not yours? For I dare say, and am able to prove, there is none of these but are rather contrary, than conformable to scripture. Neither is A. C. or any

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 33. num. XII. Sect. 35. num. VII.

<sup>x</sup> Concil. Lateran. Can. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Concil. Const. Sess. 13.

<sup>z</sup> Propter hæresin rex non solum regno privatur, sed et filii ejus a regni successione pelluntur. Simanca, Cathol. Instit. tit. 9. §. 259. Absoluti sunt subditi a debito fidelitatis: et custodes Arcium, &c. Ibid. tit. 46. §. 37. It was stiffly avowed not long since by — "That no man could shew any one Roman catholic of note and learning, that affirmed it lawful to kill kings upon any pretext whatsoever." Now surely he that says (as Romanists do) that it is lawful to depose a king, says upon the matter, it is lawful to kill him. For kings do not use to be long lived after their deposition: and they seldom stay till grief breaks their hearts: they have assassins ready to make shorter work. But since he is so confident, I will give him an author of note, and very learned,

that speaks it out. Rex debet occidi, si sollicitet populum colere idola, vel deserere legem Dei. Tostat. in 2 Sam. c. 11. q. 17. And he makes bold with scripture to prove it, Deut. xiii. And Emanuel Sa in his Aphorisms, verbo Tyrannus; yet he is so moderate, that he would not have this done till he be sentenced; but then, Quisquis potest fieri executor. Mariana is far worse; for he says it is lawful to kill him, postquam a paucis seditiosus sed doctis ceciperit tyrannus appellari. De Rege et Reg. Institutione, lib. i. cap. 6. Yea, but Mariana was disclaimed for this by the Jesuits. Yea, but for all that, there was an apology printed in Italy, anno 1610, permissu superiorum. And there it is said, "They were all enemies of the holy name of Jesus, that condemned Mariana for any such doctrine." As for Tostatus, no sentence hath touched upon him at all for it.

Sect. 38. Jesuit able to shew any <sup>a</sup>scripture interpreted by union, or <sup>b</sup>consent of the Fathers of the primitive church, to prove any one of these; nor any definition of ancient councils, but only <sup>c</sup>Lateran, for transubstantiation, and that of <sup>d</sup>Constance for the eucharist in one kind. Which two are modern, at least, far downward from the primitive church; and have done more mischief to the church by those their determinations, than will be cured, I fear, in many generations. So whatever A. C. thinks, yet I had reason enough to leave the Jesuit to look to his own soul.

A. C. p. 70. XI.—But A. C., having, as it seems, little new matter, is at the same again, and over and over it must go, that there is but one saving faith; that this one faith was once the Roman; and that I granted one might be saved in the Roman faith. To all which I have abundantly answered <sup>e</sup>before. Marry then he infers, that he sees not how we can have our souls saved without we entirely hold this faith, being the catholic faith, which, St. Athanasius saith, “unless a man hold entirely, he cannot be saved.” Now here again is more in the conclusion than in the premises, and so the inference fails. For say there was a time in which the catholic and the Roman faith were one; and such a time there was when the Roman faith was catholic and famous through the world <sup>f</sup>: yet it doth not follow, since the <sup>g</sup>council of Trent hath added a new Creed, that this Roman faith is now the catholic; for it hath added *extranea*, things without the foundation, disputable, if not false conclusions to the faith. So that now a man may believe the whole and entire catholic faith, even as St. Athanasius requires, and yet justly refuse for dross a great part of that which is now <sup>h</sup>the Roman faith. And Athana-

<sup>a</sup> Corpus Christi veraciter esse in eucharistia ex evangelio habemus: conversionem vero panis in corpus Christi evangelium non explicavit, sed expresse ab ecclesia accepimus. Cajetan. in Thom. 3. q. 75. Art. 1.

<sup>b</sup> De transubstantiatione panis in corpus Christi rara est in antiquis scriptoribus mentio. Alph. a Castro, lib. viii. advers. Hær. verbo Indulgentia.

<sup>c</sup> Concil. Lateran. Can. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Concil. Const. Sess. 13.

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 35. num. I. and Sect. 38. num. X.

<sup>f</sup> Rom. i. 8.

<sup>g</sup> Concil. Trident. Bulla Pii 4. super forma juramenti professionis fidei ad finem. Conc. Trident.

<sup>h</sup> And this is so much the more remarkable, if it be true which Thomas hath. S. Athanasium non composuisse hanc manifestationem fidei per modum symboli, sed per modum doctrinæ, &c. Et deinde autoritate summi pontificis receptam esse, ut quasi regula fidei habeatur. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. A. 10. ad 3. Symbolo apostolorum addita sunt duo alia, scilicet symbolum Nicænum, et

sus himself, as if he meant to arm the catholic faith against all corrupting additions, hath, in the beginning of his <sup>i</sup>Creed, these words, “This is the catholic faith;” this, and no other; this and no other than here follows. And again, at the end of his Creed, “<sup>k</sup>This is the catholic faith;” <sup>l</sup>this, and no more than is here delivered, (always presupposing the Apostles’ Creed, as Athanasius did,) and this is the largest of all Creeds. So that if A. C. would wipe his eyes from the mist which rises about Tiber, he might see how our souls may be saved, believing the catholic faith, and that entire, without the addition of Roman leaven. But if he cannot, or, I doubt, will not see it, it is enough that by God’s grace we see it. And therefore once more I leave him and his to look to their own souls.

Sect. 38.

XII.—After, this A. C. is busy in unfolding the meaning A. C. p. 70. of this great Father of the church, St. Athanasius. And he tells us, “that he says in his Creed, that without doubt every man shall perish that holds not the catholic faith entire” (that is,” saith A. C., “in every point of it) and inviolate (that is, in the right sense), and for the true formal reason of divine revelation, sufficiently applied to our understanding by the infallible authority of the catholic church, proposing to us by her pastors this revelation.” Well, we shall not differ much from A. C. in expounding the meaning of St. Athanasius; yet some few things I shall here observe. And first, I agree, that he which hopes for salvation, must believe the catholic faith whole and entire in every point. Next, I agree, that he must likewise hold it inviolate if to believe it in the right sense be to hold it inviolate. But by A. C.’s leave, the believing of the Creed in the right sense is comprehended in the first branch, the keeping of it whole and entire. For no man can properly be said to believe the whole Creed, that believes not the whole sense as well as the letter of it, and as entirely. But thirdly, for the word *inviolate*, it is indeed used by him that translated Athanasius; but the Father’s own

S. Athanasii, ad majorem fidei explanationem. Biel. in 3 Sent. D. 25. q. unica. A. 1. D.

<sup>i</sup> S. Athanas. in Symb.

<sup>k</sup> And yet the council of Trent, having added twelve new articles, says thus of them also: Hæc est vera catholica fi-

des, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, &c. Bulla Pii 4. super forma juramenti professionis fidei. In fine Concil. Trident.

<sup>l</sup> Integram fidei veritatem ejus doctrina breviter continet. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. A. 10. ad 3.

Sect. 38. words, following the common edition, are, “that he that will be saved, must keep the faith *ὀγιῆ καὶ ἄμωμον*.” Now *ὀγιῆς* is the sound and entire faith: and it cannot be a sound faith unless the sense be as whole and entire as the letter of the Creed. And *ἄμωμος* is compounded of the privative particle *ἀ* and *μῶμος*, which is *reproach*, or *infamy*. So that *ἄμωμος* signifies the holding of the entire faith in such holiness of life and conversation, as is without all infamy and reproach. That is, as our English renders that Creed exceeding well: “Which faith unless a man do keep whole and “undefiled,” even with such a life as Momus himself shall not be able to carp at. So Athanasius (who, certainly, was passing able to express himself in his own language) in the beginning of that his Creed requires, that we keep it entire, without diminution; and undefiled, without blame; and at the end, that we believe it faithfully without wavering. But *inviolatē* is the mistaken word of the old interpreter, and with no great knowledge made use of by A. C. And then fourthly, though this be true divinity, that he which hopes for salvation must believe the whole Creed, and in the right sense too, (if he be able to comprehend it,) yet I take the true and first meaning of *inviolatē* (could Athanasius’s word *ἄμωμος* have signified so) not to be the holding of the true sense, but not to offer violence, or a forced sense or meaning upon the Creed, which every man doth not, that yet believes it not in a true sense. For not to believe the true sense of the Creed is one thing; but it is quite another to force a wrong sense upon it. Fifthly, a reason would be given also why A. C. is so earnest for the whole faith, and baulks the word which goes with it, which is, *holy*, or *undefiled*. For Athanasius doth alike exclude from salvation those which keep not the catholic faith *holy*, as well as these which keep it not *whole*. I doubt, this was to spare many of his °holy Fathers, the popes, who were as far as any (the very lewdest among men, without exception) from keeping the catholic faith holy. Sixthly, I agree to the next part of his exposition, that a man that will be saved must believe the whole Creed, for the true formal reason of divine revelation. For upon the truth of God thus revealed

° Sic ecclesia dicitur *ἄμωμος*, Eph. v. 27. et in veteri glossario, *immaculatus*, *ἄμωμος*.  
 ° Sect. 33. num. VI.



by himself, lies the infallible certainty of the Christian faith. Sect. 38. But I do not grant that this is within the compass of St. Athanasius his word *ἀμωμος*, nor of the word *inviolate*. But in that respect, it is a mere strain of A. C. And then lastly, though the whole catholic church be sufficient in applying this to us and our belief, not our understanding, which A. C. A. C. p. 70. is at again, yet infallible she is not in the proposal of this revelation to us by every of her pastors; some whereof amongst you, as well as others, neglect or forget, at least, to feed Christ's sheep, as Christ and his church hath fed them.

XIII.—But now that A. C. hath taught us (as you see) A. C. p. 70. the meaning of St. Athanasius, in the next place he tells us, “That if we did believe any one article, we (finding the same formal reason in all, and applied sufficiently by the same means to all) would easily believe all.” Why surely we do not believe any one article only, but all the articles of the Christian faith: and we believe them for the same formal reason in all; namely, because they are revealed from and by God, and sufficiently applied in his word and by his church's ministrations. “But so long as they do not believe all in this sort,” saith A. C. Look you, he tells us we do not believe A. C. p. 70. all, when we profess we do. Is this man become as God, that he can better tell what we believe than we ourselves? Surely we do believe all, and in that sort too: though I believe, were St. Athanasius himself alive again, and a plain man should come to him and tell him he believed his Creed in all and every particular, he would admit him for a good catholic Christian, though he were not able to express to him the formal reason of that his belief. “Yea, but,” saith A. C., “while A. C. p. 70. they will, as all heretics do, make choice of what they will and what they will not believe, without relying upon the infallible authority of the catholic church, they cannot have that one saving faith in any one article.” Why, but whatsoever heretics do, we are not such, nor do we so. For they which believe all the articles (as once again I tell you we do) make no choice: and we do rely upon the infallible authority of the word of God and the whole catholic church: and therefore we both can have, and have that one saving faith, which believes all the articles entirely, though we cannot believe that any particular church is infallible.

Sect. 38. XIV.—And yet again, A. C. will not thus be satisfied, but  
 A. C. p. 71. on he goes, and adds, “ That although we believe the same truth which other good catholics do in some articles, yet not believing them for the same formal reason of divine revelation, sufficiently applied by infallible church-authority, &c. we cannot be said to have one and the same infallible and divine faith which other good catholic Christians have, who believe the articles for this formal reason, sufficiently made known unto them, not by their own fancy nor the fallible authority of human deductions, but by the infallible authority of the church of God.” If A. C. will still say the same thing, I must still give the same answer. First, he confesses we believe the same truth in some articles, (I pray mark his phrase,) “ the same truth in some articles,” with other good catholic Christians. So far his pen hath told truth against his will: for he doth not (I wot well) intend to call us catholics, and yet his pen being truer than himself, hath let it fall. For the word *other* cannot be so used as here it is, but that we as well as they must be good catholics; for he that shall say, The old Romans were valiant as well as other men, supposes the Romans to be valiant men; and he that shall say, The protestants believe some articles as well as other good catholics, must, in propriety of speech, suppose them to be good catholics. Secondly, as we do believe those some articles, so do we believe them and all other articles of faith for the same formal reason, and so applied, as but just before I have expressed. Nor do we believe any one article of faith by our own fancy, or by fallible authority of human deductions; but, next to the infallible authority of God’s word, we are guided by his church. But then A. C. steps into a conclusion, which  
 A. C. p. 71. we cannot follow him: for he says, “ That the article to be believed must be sufficiently made known unto us by the infallible authority of the church of God; that is, of men infallibly assisted by the Spirit of God, as all lawfully called, continued, and confirmed general councils are assisted.” That the whole church of God is infallibly assisted by the Spirit of God, so that it cannot by any error fall away totally from Christ the foundation, I make no doubt: for if it could, the

gates of hell had prevailed against it; which our Saviour assures me <sup>Sect. 38.</sup> they shall never be able to do. But that all general councils, be they never so lawfully called, continued, and confirmed, have infallible assistance, I utterly deny. It is true, that a general council *de post facto*, after it is ended, and admitted by the whole church, is then infallible; for it cannot err in that which it hath already clearly and truly determined without error. But that a general council *a parte ante*, when it first sits down and continues to deliberate, may truly be said to be infallible in all its after-determinations, whatsoever they shall be, I utterly deny. And it may be, it was not without cunning that A. C. shuffled these words together, *called, continued, and confirmed*: for be it never so lawfully called and continued, it may err. But after it is confirmed, that is, admitted by the whole church, then being found true, it is also infallible; that is, it deceives no man. For so all truth is, and is to us, when it is once known to be truth. But then, many times that truth, which being known is necessary and infallible, was before both contingent and fallible in the way of proving it, and to us. And so here, a general council is a most probable, but yet a fallible way of inducing truth, though the truth once induced may be (after it is found) necessary and infallible. And so likewise the very council itself, for that particular in which it hath concluded truth: but A. C. must both speak and mean of a council set down to deliberate, or else he says nothing.

XV.—Now hence A. C. gathers, “That though every thing defined to be a divine truth, in general councils, is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed (as some other truths are) by all sorts; yet no man may (after knowledge that they are thus defined) doubt deliberately, much less obstinately deny, the truth of any thing so defined.” Well, in this collection of A. C., first, we have this granted, that every thing defined in general councils is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed by all sorts of men: and this no protestant, that I know, denies. Secondly, it is affirmed, that after knowledge that these truths are thus defined, no man may doubt deliberately, much less

Sect. 38.

obstinately deny any of them. Truly, *obstinately* (as the word is now in common use) carries a fault along with it: and it ought to be far from the temper of a Christian to be obstinate against the definitions of a general council. But that he may not, upon very probable grounds, in an humble and peaceable manner, deliberately doubt, yea, and upon demonstrative grounds, constantly deny even such definitions, yet submitting himself and his grounds to the church, in that or another council, is that which was never till now imposed upon believers. For it is one thing for a man deliberately to doubt, and modestly to propose his doubt for satisfaction, which was ever lawful and is many times necessary; and quite another thing for a man, upon the pride of his own judgment, <sup>s</sup>to refuse external obedience to the council; which to do was never lawful, nor can ever stand with any government: for there is all the reason in the world the council should be heard for itself, as well as any such recusant whatsoever, and that before a judge as good as itself at least. And to what end did <sup>t</sup>St. Augustine say “that one general council might be amended by another, the former by the latter,” if men might neither deny, nor so much as deliberately doubt of any of these truths defined in a general council? And A. C. should have done well to have named but one ancient Father of the primitive church that ever affirmed this. <sup>u</sup>For the assistance which God gives to the whole church in general, is but in things simply necessary to eternal salvation; therefore more than this cannot be given to a general council; no, nor so much. But then, if a general council shall forget itself, and take upon it to define things not absolutely necessary to be expressly known or actually believed, (which are the things which A. C. here speaks of;) in these, as neither general council, nor the whole church have infallible assistance, so have Christians liberty, modestly and peaceably, and upon just grounds, both deliberately to doubt and constantly to deny such the council’s definitions. For instance; the council of Florence first defined purgatory to be

<sup>s</sup> Sect. 32. num. V.

rioribus emendari.

<sup>t</sup> De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. ii. cap. 3.<sup>u</sup> Sect. 21. num. V.

Ipsaque plenaria, sæpe priora a poste-

believed as a divine truth and matter of faith, (<sup>x</sup>if that council had consent enough so to define it:) this was afterwards deliberately doubted of by the protestants; after this as constantly denied, then confirmed by the <sup>y</sup>council of Trent, and an anathema set upon the head of every man that denies it. And yet scarce any Father within the first three hundred years ever thought of it.

XVI.—I know <sup>z</sup>Bellarmino affirms it boldly, “That all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, did constantly teach purgatory from the very apostles’ times.” And where he brings his proofs out of the Fathers for this point, he divides them into two ranks. In the first, <sup>a</sup>he reckons them which affirm prayer for the dead, as if that must necessarily infer purgatory; whereas most certain it is, that the ancients had and gave other reasons of prayer for the dead, than freeing them out of any purgatory: and this is very learnedly and at large set down by the now learned <sup>b</sup>primate of Armagh. But then in the second, he says, “there are <sup>c</sup>most manifest places in the Fathers in which they affirm purgatory.” And he names there no fewer than two and twenty of the Fathers. A great jury certainly, did they give their verdict with him. But first, within the three hundred years after Christ, he names none but Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. And <sup>d</sup>Tertullian speaks expressly of hell, not of purgatory. <sup>e</sup>St. Cyprian of a purging to amendment, which cannot be after this life. As for <sup>f</sup>Origen, he, I think, indeed was the first founder of purgatory;

<sup>x</sup> I know the Greeks subscribed that council. Sed in illo concilio Græca ecclesia diu restitit. Pet. Mart. Loc. Com. classe tertia, cap. 9. num. 13.—Et in ultima sessione istius concilii Græci dixerunt se sine autoritate totius ecclesiæ orientalis quæstionem aliam tractare non posse, præter illam de processione Spiritus Sancti. Postea vero, consentiente imperatore, tractarunt de aliis, &c. Florent. Conc. Sess. ult. apud Nicolinum, tom. iv. p. 894, &c. This savours of some art to bring in the Greeks. Howsoever, this shews enough against Bellarmine, that all the Greeks did not constantly teach purgatory, as he affirms, de Purgat. lib. i. c. 11. §. De tertio modo.

<sup>y</sup> Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, et in Bulla Pii IV. super forma juramenti profes-

sionis fidei.

<sup>z</sup> Omnes veteres Græci et Latini ab ipso tempore apostolorum constanter docuerunt purgatorium esse. Bellarm. de Purg. lib. i. cap. 11. §. De tertio modo.

<sup>a</sup> Bellarm. de Purg. lib. i. cap. 6. §. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Jac. Usher Armachan. in his Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, cap. 7. p. 194.

<sup>c</sup> Sunt apertissima loca in Patribus, ubi asserunt purgatorium. Bellarm. de Purg. lib. i. cap. 6. §. Deinde sunt.

<sup>d</sup> Tertull. lib. de Anim. cap. 17. infer.

<sup>e</sup> Cypr. lib. iv. ep. 2. Emendari igne.

<sup>f</sup> Origen. *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, lib. i. cap. 6. S. Hieron. in Jonæiii. Bellarm. de Purg. lib. i. cap. 2. §. Porro non. S. August. Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 17.



Sect. 38. but of such an one as, I believe, Bellarmine dares not affirm. “For he thought there was no punishment after this life but purgatory; and that not only the most impious men, but even the devils themselves should be saved, after they had suffered and been purged enough.” Which is directly contrary to the word of God expounded by his church. In the fourth and fifth (the great and learned ages of the church) he names more, as <sup>h</sup>St. Ambrose: but St. Ambrose says, That some shall be saved *quasi per ignem*, as it were by fire; leaving it as doubtful what was meant by that fire, as the place itself doth whence it is taken, <sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. iii. <sup>k</sup>St. Hierome indeed names a purging by fire; but it is not very plain that he means it after this life. And howsoever, this is most plain, that St. Hierome is at *Credimus*, we believe eternal punishment; but he goes no further than *Arbitramur*, we think there is a purging. So with him it was arbitrary, and therefore sure no matter of faith then. And again <sup>l</sup>he saith, that some Christians may be saved *post penas*, after some punishments endured, but he neither tells us where nor when. <sup>m</sup>St. Basil names indeed purgatory fire; but he relates as uncertainly to that in 1 Cor. iii. as St. Ambrose doth. As for <sup>n</sup>Paulinus, he speaks for prayer for the dead, but not a word of purgatory. And the place in <sup>o</sup>St. Gregory Nazianzen is far from a manifest place. For he speaks there of baptism by fire, which is no <sup>p</sup>usual phrase to signify purgatory. But yet say that here he doth, there is a *τυχόν*, a *fortassis*, a peradventure in the words, which Bellarmine cunningly leaves out; and if it be a peradventure ye shall then be baptized with fire, why then it is at a peradventure too that ye shall not. Now such casual stuff as this, peradventure you shall, and peradventure you shall not, is no expression for things which are valued to be *de fide*, and to be believed as matters of faith. Bellarmine goes on with <sup>q</sup>Lactantius, but with no better success: for he

g August. Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 17.

h S. Ambros. in Psal. xxxvi. 14.

i 1 Cor. iii. 15.

k S. Hieron. in lxvi. Isai. fine.

l S. Hieron. cont. Pelag. lib. iv. ultra medium.

m S. Basil. in Isai. ix.

n Paulin. ep. 1.

o Greg. Naz. Orat. 39. fine.

p I think the first that ever used that phrase, *baptism by fire*, was Origen. And he used it for martyrdom, as clearly appears by a passage of his in Euseb. Hist. lib. vi. cap. 4. edit. Græc. Lat. Coloniae Allob. 1612.

q Lact. lib. vii. cap. 21.

says indeed that some men *perstringentur igne*, shall be sharply touched by fire. But he speaks of such, *quorum peccata prævaluerunt*, whose sins have prevailed. And they in Bellarmine's doctrine are for hell, not purgatory. As for St. Hilary, 'he will not come home neither. It is true, he speaks of a fire too, and one that must be endured; but he tells us, it is a punishment *expiandæ a peccatis animæ*, to purge the soul from sins. Now this will not serve Bellarmine's turn: for they of Rome teach, that the sins are forgiven here, and that the temporal punishment only remains to be satisfied in purgatory. And what need is there then of purging of sins? Lest there should not be Fathers enough, he reckons in <sup>s</sup>Boetius too: but he, though not long before a convert, yet was so well seen in this point, that he goes no further than *Puto*, I think that after death some souls are exercised *purgatoria clementia*, with a purgative clemency. But *Puto*, I think it is so, is no expression for matter of faith. The two pregnant authorities which seem to come home are those of Gregory Nyssen and Theodoret: but for 'Theodoret in Scholiis Græcis, (which is the place Bellarmine quotes,) I can find no such thing; and manifest it is, Bellarmine <sup>u</sup>himself took it but upon trust. And for <sup>x</sup>St. Gregory Nyssen, it is true, some places in him seem plain; but then they are made so doubtful by other places in him, that I dare not say simply and roundly what his judgment was: for he says, "Men must be purged from perturbations, and either by prayers and philosophy, or the study of wisdom, or by the furnace of purgatory fire after this life." And again, "That a man cannot be partaker *θειότητος*, of the divine nature, unless the purging fire doth take away the stains that are in his soul." And again, "That after this life a purgatory fire takes away the blots and propensity to evil." And I deny not, divers other like places are in him. But first, this is quite another thing from the Roman purgatory. For St. Gregory tells us here, that the purgatory he means purges perturbations, and

r S. Hilar. in Psal. cxviii. 20.

s Boetius, lib. iv. Pros. 4.

t Theod in 1 Cor. iii.

u Bellarm. de Purgat. lib. i. cap. 4.

§. Ex Græcis habemus.

x S. Greg. Nyss. Orat. de Mortuis.

p. 1066. edit. Paris. 1615. tom. ii. Διά προσευχῆς τε καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐκκαθαρθεῖς ἢ μετὰ τὴν, &c.—Τὸν ἐμμιχθέντα τῇ ψυχῇ ῥυπὸν, &c. ibid. p. 1067.—Ἐν τῷ καθαροῖφ πυρὶ ἀποβαλλόντων, &c. ibid. p. 1068.

Sect. 38. stains, and blots, and propensity to evil: whereas the purgatory which Rome now teaches purges not sin, “ybut is only satisfactory by way of punishment for sins already forgiven, but for which satisfaction was not made before their death.” Secondly, St. Gregory Nyssen himself seems not obscurely to relate to some other fire: zfor he says expressly, “That the soul is to be punished, till the vitiosity of it be consumed *purgatorio igne* ;” so the translation renders it; but in the original it is τῷ ἀκομήτῳ πυρὶ, that is, in a fire that sleeps not; which, for aught appears, may be understood of a fire that is eternal: whereas the fire assigned to purgatory shall cease. Besides, St. Gregory says plainly, “The soul cannot suffer by fire but in the body; and the body cannot be with it till the resurrection.” Therefore ahe must needs speak of a fire after the resurrection, which must be either the fire of the general conflagration, or hell: purgatory he cannot mean; where, according to the Romish tenet, the soul suffers without the body. The truth is, divers of the ancients, especially Greeks, which wére a little too much acquainted with Plato’s school, bphilosophized and disputed upon this and some other points with much obscurity, and as little certainty. So upon the whole matter, in the fourth and fifth hundred year, you see here is none that constantly and perspicuously affirm it. And as for St. Augustine, he csaid and dunsaid it, and eat the last left it doubtful; which, had it then been received as a point of faith, he durst not have done. Indeed then, in St. Gregory the Great’s time, in the beginning of the sixth age, purgatory was grown to some perfection. For fSt. Gregory himself is at *Scio*, (it was but at *Puto* a

y Item definimus, si vere penitentes in Dei charitate decesserint, antequam dignis penitentiæ fructibus de commissis et ommissis satisfecerint, penis purgatoris post mortem purgari. Concil. Florent. circa prin. per Bin. edit. Colon. 1618.

z S. Greg. Nyss. de Anima et Resur. tom. ii. p. 658.

a S. Greg. Orat. 3. de Resurrect. Christi.

b Non expedit philosophari altius, &c. Orig. cont. Celsum, lib. vi.

c Constat animas purgari post hanc vitam. S. August. Civit. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 24. vide.

d Justorum flagella non incipiunt

post mortem, sed desinunt. Et anima mox in paradisum, &c. S. August. cont. Fœlicianum, cap. 15.—Et duo tantum loca esse, &c. S. August. Serm. 19. de Verb. Apost. cap. 15.—Et de Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 16. fine, negat, nisi sit ignis ille in consummatione sæculi.

e Quæri potest, &c. S. Aug. in Eucharid. cap. 69. Forsitan verum est, &c. S. August. de Civit. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 26. Quid S. Paulus senserit, 1 Cor. iii. de igne illo, malo intelligentiores, et doctiores audire. S. August. lib. de Fide et Oper. cap. 16.

f S. Greg. in Psal. iii. Penitentialem princ.

little before,) I know that some shall be expiated in purgatory flames. And therefore I will easily give Bellarmine all that follow: for after this time purgatory was found too warm a business to be suffered to cool again. And in the afterages, more were frighted than led by proof into the belief of it.

XVII.—Now by this we see also that it could not be a tradition, for then we might have traced it by the smoke to the apostles' times. Indeed Bellarmine would have it such a tradition: for he tells us out of <sup>g</sup>St. Augustine, "That that is rightly believed to be delivered by apostolical authority which the whole church holds, and hath ever held, and yet is not instituted by any council." And he adds, that purgatory is such a tradition, so constantly held in the whole church, Greek and Latin; and "<sup>h</sup>that we do not find any beginning of this belief." Where I shall take the boldness to observe these three things. First, that the doctrine of purgatory was not held ever in the whole catholic church of Christ. And this appears by the proofs of <sup>i</sup>Bellarmino himself produced, and I have <sup>k</sup>before examined. For there it is manifest that scarce two Fathers directly affirm the belief of purgatory for full six hundred years after Christ. Therefore purgatory is no matter of faith, nor to be believed, as descending from apostolical authority, by St. Augustine's rule. Secondly, that we can find a beginning of this doctrine, and a beginner too, namely Origen. And neither Bellarmine nor any other is able to shew any one Father of the church that said it before him. Therefore purgatory is not to be believed as a doctrine delivered by apostolical authority, by Bellarmine's own rule; for it hath a beginning. Thirdly, I observe too, that Bellarmine cannot well tell where to lay the foundation of purgatory, that it may be safe: for first, he labours to found it upon scripture. To that end <sup>l</sup>he brings no fewer than ten places out of the Old Testament, and nine out of the New, to prove it: and yet, fearing lest

<sup>g</sup> Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur. S. August. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24.—Nec ad summos pontifices referri potest, addit Melch. Canus de Locis, lib. iii. c. 4. prin.

<sup>h</sup> Non invenimus initium hujus dogmatis, sed omnes veteres Græci et Latini, &c. Bellarm. de Purg. lib. i. c. 11. §. De tertio modo.

<sup>i</sup> De Purg. lib. i. c. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Sect. 38. num. XVI.

<sup>l</sup> Bellarm. de Purgat. lib. i. c. 3, 4.

Sect. 38. these places be strained, (as indeed they are,) and so too weak to be laid under such a vast pile of building as purgatory is<sup>m</sup>, he flies to unwritten tradition. And by this word of God unwritten, he says, it is manifest that the doctrine of purgatory was delivered by the apostles. Sure, if nineteen places of scripture cannot prove it, I would be loath to fly to tradition. And if recourse to tradition be necessary, then certainly those places of scripture made not the proof they were brought for. And once more; how can Bellarmine say here, that we find not the beginning *hujus dogmatis*, of this article, when he had said before, that he had found it in the “nineteen places of scripture?” For if in these places he could not find the beginning of the doctrine of purgatory, he is false while he says he did. And if he did find it there, then he is false here in saying we find no beginning of it. And for all his brags of <sup>n</sup>*Omnes ceteres*, “All the ancient Greek and Latin do constantly teach purgatory;” yet <sup>o</sup>Alphonsus a Castro deals honestly and plainly, and tells us, “That the mention of purgatory in ancient writers is *fere nulla*, almost none at all, especially in the Greeks.”

And he adds, “That hereupon purgatory is not believed by the Grecians to this very day.” And what now, I pray, after all this, may I not so much as deliberately doubt of this because it is now defined? and but now in a manner? and thus? No, sure. So A. C. tells you. Doubt! No. For when you had fooled the archbishop of Spalatro back to Rome, there you either made him say, or said it for him, (p for in print it is, and under his name,) that since it is now defined by the church, a man is as much bound to believe there is a purgatory, as that there is a trinity of persons in the

<sup>m</sup> De tertio modo perspicuum est, &c. Bellar. de Purg. lib. i. c. 11. §. Tertio ex verbo, &c. et §. De tertio modo, &c.

<sup>n</sup> Omnes veteres Græci et Latini, &c. Bellarm. de Purgat. lib. i. c. 11. §. De tertio modo.

<sup>o</sup> De purgatorio in antiquis scriptoribus potissimum Græcis fere nulla mentio est. Qua de causa usque in hodiernum diem purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum. Alphonsus a Castro advers. Hæres. lib. viii. verbo Indulgentia.

<sup>p</sup> Purgatorium nullum esse, est manifesta hæresis, &c. M. Anton. de Dominis sui reditus ex Anglia consilium exponit. Paris. 1623. p. 17.—Merita, indulgentiæ, et reliqua, quæ superius ut in ecclesia definita commemoravi, sunt omnes articuli fundamentales, quia non minus nituntur revelationi quam priora de Trinitate. Ibid. p. 32.—And so much A. C. himself says of all points, in which, in the doctrine of the faith, protestants differ from them, in his Relation of the first Conference, p. 28.



Godhead. How far comes this short of blasphemy, to make Sect. 38. the Trinity and purgatory things alike and equally credible?

XVIII.—Yea, but A. C. will give you a reason why no man may deliberately doubt, much less deny, any thing that is defined by a general council. And his reason is, “Because A. C. p. 71. every such doubt and denial is a breach from the one saving faith.” This is a very good reason, if it be true. But how appears it to be true? How! Why, “It takes away,” saith A. C., “infallible credit from the church; and so the divine A. C. p. 71. revelation not being sufficiently applied, it cannot, according to the ordinary course of God’s providence, breed infallible belief in us.” Why, but deliberately to doubt and constantly to deny, upon the grounds and in the manner<sup>q</sup> aforesaid, doth not take away infallible credit from the whole church, but only from the definition of a general council, some way or other misled; and that in things not absolutely necessary to all men’s salvation; for of such things †A. C. here speaks expressly. Now to take away the infallible credit from some definitions of general councils, in things not absolutely necessary to salvation, is no breach upon the one saving faith which is necessary, nor upon the credit of the catholic church of Christ in things absolutely necessary; for which only it had infallible assistance promised. So that no breach being made upon the faith, nor no credit which ever it had being taken from the church, the divine revelation may be and is as sufficiently applied as ever it was; and in the ordinary course of God’s providence may breed as infallible belief in things necessary to salvation as ever it did.

XIX.—But A. C. will prove his reason before given, and therefore he asks out of St. Paul, “*How shall men believe unless A. C. p. 71. they hear? how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, (to wit, infallibly,) unless they be sent; that is, from God, and infallibly assisted by his Spirit?*” Here is that which I have twice at least spoken to already, namely, that A. C. by this will make every priest in the church of Rome that hath learning enough to preach, and dissents not from that church, an infallible preacher; which no Father of the

<sup>q</sup> Sect. 38. num. V.

<sup>r</sup> “Though every thing defined to be a divine truth in general councils is not absolutely necessary to be expressly

known and actually believed by all sorts,” &c. A. C. p. 71.

<sup>s</sup> Rom. x. 14, 15.

Sect. 38. primitive church did ever assume to himself nor the church give him: and yet the Fathers of the primitive church were sent, and from God; were assisted, and by God; and did sufficiently propose to men the divine revelation, and did by it beget and breed up faith, saving faith, in the souls of men; though<sup>t</sup> no one among them, since the apostles, was an infallible preacher. And A. C. should have done very well here to have made it manifest that this scripture, *How shall they preach*, (to wit, infallibly,) is so interpreted by union, consent of Fathers, and definitions of councils, as he<sup>u</sup> bragged before that they use to interpret scripture: for I do not find, *How shall they preach*, (to wit, <sup>x</sup>infallibly,) to be the comment of any one of the Fathers, or any other approved author; and let him shew it if he can.

A. C. p. 70.

XX.—After this (for I see the good man is troubled, and forward and backward he goes) he falls immediately upon this question: “If a whole general council, defining what is divine truth, be not believed to be sent and assisted by God’s Spirit, and consequently of infallible credit, what man in the world can be said to be of infallible credit?” Well, first, A. C. hath very ill luck in fitting his conclusion to his premises, and his consequent to his antecedent: and so it is here with him. For a general council may be assisted by God’s Spirit, and in a great measure too, and in a greater than any private man, not inspired, and yet not consequently be of infallible credit:

A. C. p. 71.

<sup>t</sup> Alios (ab authoribus canonice scripturæ) ita lege, ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque præpoleant, non ideo verum putem, quod ipsi ita senserunt, vel scripserunt. Thom. p. 1. q. 1. Art. 8. ad 2. ex S. August. epist. 19.—Mihi non credas, nisi demonstrationem accipias ex sacris literis. S. Cyril. Hierosol. Cat. 4.

<sup>u</sup> A. C. p. 70.

<sup>x</sup> Verba hæc apostoli non possunt intelligi de fide infusa, illa enim immediate a Deo creata est, et non est ex auditu ut hæc. Apertissime colligitur ex Biel. in 3. Sent. D. 23. q. 2. A. 2. Conc. 1.—Ergo fides acquisita necessaria est. Ibid.—Sed præter acquisitam, infusa etiam requiritur, et non solum propter intentionem actus, sed etiam propter assensum et certitudinem. Quia non potest esse firmus assensus a fide acquisita. Quia per eam nullus credit

alicui, nisi quem scit posse falli et fallere, licet credat eum non velle fallere. Scotus in 3. Sent. D. 23. q. unica.—Therefore, in the judgment of your own school, your preachers can both deceive and be deceived; and therefore certainly are not infallible. And M. Canus very expressly makes this but an introduction to infallible faith: Primum ergo id statuo juxta communem legem aliqua exteriora et humana incitamenta necessaria esse, quibus ad evangelii fidem inducamur. *Quomodo enim credent ei, quem non audierunt?* etc. Canus de Locis, lib. ii. c. 8. §. Primum ergo.—Et iterum: Si fides infusa ita fidei acquisitæ niteretur, tanquam suo fundamento; ipsum fundamentum fidei nostræ non esset divina, sed humana veritas. Ibid. §. Cui et tertium. Therefore surely A. C. abuses this place of the apostle very boldly.

for all assistance of God's Spirit reaches not up to infallibility. Sect. 38.

I hope the ancient bishops and Fathers of the primitive church were assisted by God's Spirit, and in a plentiful measure too, and yet A. C. himself will not say they were infallible. And, secondly, for the question itself; "If a general council be not, what man in the world can be said to be of infallible credit?" Truly, I will make you a ready answer: No man. Not the pope himself? No: *let God and his word be true, and every man a liar*; for so, more or less, every man will be found to be. And this is neither damage to the church, nor wrong to the person of any.

XXI.—But then A. C. asks a shrewder question than this. A. C. p. 71.

"If such a council lawfully called, continued, and confirmed, may err in defining any one divine truth, how can we be infallibly certain of any other truth defined by it? <sup>z</sup> for if it may err in one, why not in another, and another, and so in all?" It is most true, if such a council may err in one, it may in another, and another, and so in all of like nature: I say, in all of like nature. And A. C. may remember he expressed himself a little before, to speak of the defining of A. C. p. 71. such divine truths, as are not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed of all sorts of men. Now there is, there can be no necessity of an infallible certainty in the whole catholic church, and much less in a general council, of things not <sup>a</sup>absolutely necessary in themselves. For Christ did not intend to leave an infallible certainty in his church, to satisfy either contentious, or curious, or presumptuous spirits. And therefore, in things not fundamental, not necessary, it is no matter if councils err in one, and another, and a third; the whole church having power and means enough to see that no council err in necessary things, and this is certainty enough for the church to have, or for Christians to expect; especially since the foundation is so strongly and so plainly laid down in scripture and the Creed, that a modest man might justly wonder why any man should run to any later council, at least for any infallible certainty.

XXII.—Yet A. C. hath more questions to ask; and his A. C. p. 72.

<sup>y</sup> Romans iii. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Sect. 21. num. V.

<sup>z</sup> Sect. 10. num. XV.

Sect. 38. next is, "How we can (according to the ordinary course) be infallibly assured that it errs in one and not in another, when it equally by one and the same authority defines both to be divine truth?" A. C., taking here upon him to defend Mr. Fisher the Jesuit, could not but see what I had formerly written concerning this difficult question about general councils. And to all that (being large) he replied little or nothing. Now, when he thinks that may be forgotten, or as if it did not at all lie in his way, he here turns questionist, to disturb that business, and indeed the church, as much as he can. But to this question also I answer again, If any general council do now err, either it errs in things absolutely necessary to salvation, or in things not necessary. If it err in things necessary, we can be infallibly assured by the scripture, the Creeds, the four first councils, and the whole church, where it errs in one, and not in another. If it be *in non necessariis*, in things not necessary, it is not requisite that we should have for them an infallible assurance. As for that which follows, it is notoriously both cunning and false. It is false to suppose that a general council, defining two things for divine truths, and erring in one, but not erring in another, doth define both equally by one and the same authority. And it is cunning, because these words, "by the same authority," are equivocal, and must be distinguished, that the truth, which A. C. would hide, may appear. Thus then, suppose a general council, erring in one point, and not in another; it doth define both and equally by the same delegated authority which that council hath received from the catholic church. But it doth not define both, and much less equally, by the same authority of the scripture, (which must be the council's rule, as well as private men's;) no, nor by the same authority of the whole catholic church, (who did not intentionally give them equal power to define truth, and error for truth.) And I hope A. C. dares not say the scripture (according to which all councils that will uphold divine truth must determine) doth equally give either ground or power to define error and truth.

A. C. p. 72. XXIII.—To his former questions A. C. adds, "That if we leave this to be examined by any private man, this examination not being infallible had need to be examined by

another, and this by another, without end, or ever coming to Sect. 38. infallible certainty, necessarily required in that one faith which is necessary to salvation, and to that peace and unity which ought to be in the church." Will this inculcating the same thing never be left? I told the Jesuit <sup>b</sup>before, that I give no way to any private man to be judge of a general council: and there also I shewed the way how an erring council might be rectified, and the peace of the church either preserved or restored, without lifting any private spirit above a council, and without this process *in infinitum* (which A. C. so much urges, and which is so much declined in all <sup>c</sup>sciences). For as the understanding of a man must always have somewhat to rest upon, so must his faith. But a <sup>d</sup>private man, first for his own satisfaction, and after for the church's, if he have just cause, may consider of and examine, by the <sup>e</sup>judgment of discretion, though not of power, even the definitions of a general council. But A. C. concludes well, "That an infallible certainty is necessary for that one faith which is necessary to salvation." And of that (as I expressed <sup>f</sup>before) a most infallible certainty we have already in the scripture, the Creeds, and the four first general councils, to which, for things necessary and fundamental in the faith, we need no assistance from other general councils. And some of your <sup>g</sup>own, very honest and very learned, were of the same opinion with me. And for the peace and unity of the church in things absolutely necessary, we have the same infallible direction that we have for faith. But in things not necessary, (though they be divine truths also,) if about them Christian men do differ, it is no more than they have done, more or less, in all ages of the church: and they may differ, and yet preserve the <sup>h</sup>one necessary faith, and <sup>i</sup>charity too, entire,

<sup>b</sup> Sect. 32. num. V. Sect. 33. consid. 7. num. IV.

<sup>c</sup> Arist. 1. Post. Tex. 6. et 4. Method. T. 14.

<sup>d</sup> Sect. 38. num. XV.

<sup>e</sup> Hic non loquimur de decisione, seu determinatione doctrinali, qua ad unumquemque virum peritum spectare dignoscitur; sed de autoritativa et judiciali, &c. Jac. Almain. lib. de Author. Eccles. c. 10. prin.

<sup>f</sup> Sect. 38. num. I.

<sup>g</sup> Sunt qui nescio qua ducti ratione sentiunt non esse opus generali concilio (de Constantiensi loquitur) di-

centes, omnia bene a patribus nostris ordinata ac constituta, modo ab omnibus legitime et fideliter servarentur. Fatemur equidem id ipsum esse verissimum. Tamen cum nihil fere servetur, &c. Pet. de Aliaco, lib. de Reformat. Eccles. fine. So that after-councils are rather to decree for observance, than to make any new determinations of the faith.

<sup>h</sup> Non omnis error in his quæ fidei sunt, est aut infidelitas, aut hæresis. Holkot. in 1 Sent. q. 1. ad 4. K.

<sup>i</sup> Scimus quosdam quod semel imberint nolle deponere, nec propositum



Sect. 38. if they be so well minded. I confess it were heartily to be wished, that in these things also, men might be all of one mind and one judgment; to which the apostle exhorts, <sup>k</sup>1 Cor. i. But this cannot be hoped for till the church be triumphant over all human frailties, which here hang thick and close about her; the want both of unity and peace proceeding too often, even where religion is pretended, from men and their humours, rather than from things, and errors to be found in them.

A. C. p. 72. XXIV.—And so A. C. tells me, “That it is not therefore (as I would persuade) the fault of councils’ definitions, but the pride of such as will prefer, and not submit their private judgments, that lost, and continues the loss of peace and unity of the church, and the want of certainty in that one aforesaid soul-saving faith. Once again, I am bold to tell A. C., there is no want of certainty, most infallible certainty, of that one soul-saving faith. And if, for other opinions which flutter about it, there be a difference, a dangerous difference, as at this day there is; yet necessary it is not, that therefore, or for prevention thereof, there should be such a certainty, an infallible certainty, in these things. For he understood himself well that said, *Oportet esse hæreses*<sup>l</sup>, There must, there will be heresies. And wheresoever that necessity lies, it is out of doubt enough to prove, that Christ never left such an infallible assurance as is able to prevent them, or such a mastering power in his church, as is able to overawe them; but they come with their *oportet* about them, and they rise and spring in all ages very strangely. But in particular, for that which first caused and now continues the loss of unity in the church of Christ; as I make no doubt but that the pride of men is one cause, so yet can I not think that pride is the adequate and sole cause thereof. But in part pride caused it, and pride on all sides: pride in some that would not at first, nor will not since, submit their private judgments, where with good conscience they may and ought;

suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria quæ apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, &c. S. Cypr. lib. ii. epist. 1.—Concordia quæ est charitatis effectus, est unio voluntatum, non opinionum. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 37. Art. 1. C. Dis-

sentio de minimis, et de opinionibus repugnat quidem paci perfectæ, in qua plene veritas cognoscetur, et omnis appetitus complebitur. Non tamen repugnat paci imperfectæ, qualis habetur in via. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 29. Art. 3. ad 2.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. i. 10. Phil. ii. 2.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 19.

and pride in others, that would not first, nor will not yet Sect. 38. mend manifest, great, and dangerous errors; which with all good conscience they ought to do. But it is not pride not to submit to known and gross errors: and the definitions of some councils (perhaps the Lateran, Constance, and Trent) have been greater and more urgent causes of breach of unity than the pride of men hath been; which yet I shall never excuse, wherever it is.

XXV.—How far this one soul-saving faith extends, A. C. A. C. p. 72. tells me I have confessed it not a work for my pen: “but,” he says, “it is to be learned from that one, holy, catholic, apostolic, always visible, and infallible Roman church; of which the lady, once doubting, is now fully satisfied,” &c. Indeed (though A. C. sets this down with some scorn, which I can easily pass over) it is true that thus <sup>m</sup>I said: There is a latitude in faith, especially in reference to different men’s salvation; but to set a bound to this, and strictly to define it, Just thus far you must believe in every particular, or incur damnation, is no work for my pen. Thus I said, and thus I say still. For though the foundation be one and the same in all, yet a <sup>n</sup>latitude there is, and a large one too, when you come to consider, not the foundation common to all, but things necessary to many particular men’s salvation: *for to whomsoever God hath given more, of him shall more be required*<sup>o</sup>, as well in belief, as in obedience and performance. And the gifts of God, both ordinary and extraordinary, to particular men, are so various, as that, for my part, I hold it impossible for the ablest pen that is to express it. And in this respect I <sup>p</sup>said it with humility and reason, that to set these bounds was no work for my pen; nor will I ever take upon me to express that tenet or opinion (the denial of the foundation only excepted) which may shut any Christian

<sup>m</sup> Sect. 38. num. I.

<sup>n</sup> Sect. 38. num. VIII.

<sup>o</sup> Luke xii. 48. Unicuique secundum proportionem suam, secundum differentiam scientiæ vel ignorantia, &c. Et postea: Extenditur doctrina hæc, non solum ad donum scientiæ, &c. Cajetan. in S. Luc. xii. Ecce quomodo scientia aggravat culpam. Unde Gregorius, &c. Gorran. in S. Luc. xii. Therefore many things may be necessary for a knowing man’s salvation,

which are not so for a poor ignorant soul. Si quis de antecessoribus nostris vel ignoranter vel simpliciter non hoc observavit, et tenuit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo et magisterio suo docuit, potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi. Nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc a Domino admoniti et instructi sumus. S. Cypr. lib. ii. epist. 3.

<sup>p</sup> Sect. 38. num. I.

Sect. 38. out of heaven. And, A. C., I believe you know very well, to what a narrow scantling some <sup>q</sup> learned of your own side bring the very foundation itself, rather than they will lose any that lay hold on Christ the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world. And as Christ epitomises the whole law of obedience into these two great commandments, <sup>r</sup>*the love of God and our neighbour*; so the apostle epitomises the whole law of belief into these two great assents, <sup>s</sup> that *God is*, and that *he is a rewarder of them that seek him*, that seek him in Christ. And St. Peter was full of the Holy Ghost when he expressed it, That there is no salvation to them that seek it in or by another name<sup>t</sup>.

XXVI.—But since this is no work for my pen, it seems A. C. will not say it is a work <sup>u</sup>for his. But he <sup>x</sup>tells us, “It is to be learned of the one, holy, catholic, apostolic, always visible, and infallible Roman church.” Titles enough given to the Roman church: and I wish she deserved them all, for then we should have peace; but it is far otherwise. *One* she is, as a particular church, but not *the one*. Holy she would be counted; but the world may see, if it will not blind itself, of what value holiness is in that court and country. Catholic she is not, in any sense of the word; for she is not the <sup>y</sup>universal, and so not catholic in extent: nor is she sound in doctrine, and in things which come near upon the foundation too; so not <sup>z</sup>catholic in belief. Nor is she the prime mother-

<sup>q</sup> Articuli fidei sunt sicut principia per se nota. Et sicut quedam eorum in aliis implicite continentur, ita omnes articuli implicite continentur in aliquibus primis credibilibus, &c. secundum illud ad Heb. xi. Thom. 2. 2æ. q. 1. Art. 10. b.—In absoluto nobis et facili est æternitas: Jesum suscitatum a mortuis per Deum credere, et ipsum esse Dominum confiteri, &c. S. Hilar. de Trin. lib. x. ad finem.

<sup>r</sup> Matth. xxii. 37.

<sup>s</sup> Heb. xi. 6.

<sup>t</sup> Acts iv. 12.

<sup>u</sup> And yet before, in this conference, et apud A. C. p. 42, the Jesuit whom he defends hath said it expressly, “That all those are fundamental which are necessary to salvation.”

<sup>x</sup> A. C. p. 72.

<sup>y</sup> Romana ecclesia particularis. Bel-

larm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iv. cap. 4. §. 1. Catholica autem est illa quæ diffusa est per universon orbem. S. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 18.

<sup>z</sup> Catholica enim dicitur ecclesia illa quæ universaliter docet sine ullo defectu, vel differentia dogmatum. S. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 18.—Unde Augustinus subscripsit se episcopum catholicæ ecclesiæ Hipponiregiensis. De Actis cum Fælice Manich. lib. i. cap. 20. et lib. ii. cap. 1.—Et catholica Alexandrinorum. Soz. Hist. lib. i. 9. et lib. ii. cap. 3. And so every particular church is or may be called catholic, and that truly, so long as it teaches catholic doctrine. In which sense the particular Roman church was called catholic, so long as it taught all and only those things to be *de fide*, which the catholic church itself maintained. But now Rome doth not so.

church of Christianity, <sup>a</sup> Jerusalem was that; and so not Sect. 38.  
 catholic as a fountain or original, or as the head or root of  
 the catholic.

XXVII.—And because many Romanists object here, (though  
 A.C. doth it not,) that St. Cyprian called the “<sup>b</sup>Roman church,  
 the root and matrix of the catholic church of Christ;” I hope  
 I shall have leave to explain that difficult place also. First  
 then, St. Cyprian names not Rome; that stands only in the  
 margin, and was placed there as his particular judgment led  
 him<sup>c</sup> that set out St. Cyprian. Secondly, the true story of  
 that epistle, and that which led St. Cyprian into this ex-  
 pression, was this. Cornelius, then chosen pope, expostulates  
 with St. Cyprian, that his letters to Rome were directed only  
 to the clergy there, and not to him; and takes it ill, as if  
 St. Cyprian had thereby seemed to disapprove his election.  
 St. Cyprian replies, that by reason of the schism moved then  
 by Novatian, it was uncertain in Afric which of the two had  
 the more canonical right to the see of Rome, and that there-  
 fore he named him not: but yet that during this uncertainty,  
 he exhorted all that sailed thither, *ut ecclesie catholice*  
*radicem et matricem agnoscerent et tenerent*; that in all their  
 carriage they should acknowledge, and so hold themselves  
 unto, the unity of the catholic church, which is the root and  
 matrix of it, and the only way to avoid participation in the  
 schism. And that this must be St. Cyprian’s meaning, I  
 shall thus prove. First, because this could not be his mean-  
 ing or intention, that the see of Rome was the root or matrix  
 of the catholic church. For if he had told them so, he had  
 left them in as great or greater difficulty than he found  
 them. For there was then an open and an apparent schism  
 in the church of Rome; two bishops, Cornelius and Novatian;

<sup>a</sup> Supra §. 35. num. IX. Other churches  
 beside the Roman are called *matres*  
 and *originales ecclesie*, as in Tertull.  
 de Præscript. advers. Hæres. cap. 21.  
 Et ecclesia Hierosolymitana quæ aliarum  
 omnium mater: τῆς δὲ γε μητρὸς, &c.  
 Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. 9.  
 ex libello synodico a Concil. Constans-  
 tinopol. 2. transmissæ ad concilium sub  
 Damaso tum Romæ coactum. Et Con-  
 stantinopolitana ecclesia dicitur omnium  
 aliarum caput. Cod. lib. i. tit. 2. leg. 24.

That is, not simply of all churches, but  
 of all in that patriarchate. And so  
 Rome is the head of all in the Roman  
 patriarchate.

<sup>b</sup> Et ecclesie catholice radicem et  
 matricem agnoscerent et tenerent. S.  
 Cypr. lib. iv. epist. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Edit. Basilien. 1535. And Simanca  
 also applies this speech of St. Cyprian to  
 Rome, tit. 24. §. 17. And so also Pame-  
 lius upon St. Cyprian. But they wrong  
 him.

Sect. 38. two congregations, which respectively attended and observed them. So that a perplexed question must needs have divided their thoughts, which of these two had been that root and matrix of the catholic church. Therefore, had St. Cyprian meant to pronounce Rome the root and matrix of the catholic church, he would never have done it at such a time, when Rome itself was in schism. Whereas in the other sense, the counsel is good and plain; namely, that they should hold themselves to the unity and communion of the catholic church, which is the root of it. And then necessarily they were to suspend their communion there, till they saw how the catholic church did incline, to approve or disapprove the election of the one or the other. And thus St. Cyprian frees himself to Cornelius from the very least touch of schism. Secondly, because this sense comes home to <sup>d</sup>Baronius: for he affirms, that St. Cyprian and his colleagues the African bishops did *communione suspendere*, suspend their communion, until they heard by Caldonius and Fortunatus whose the undoubted right was. So it seems St. Cyprian gave that counsel to these travellers which himself followed. For if Rome, during the schism, and in so great uncertainty, had yet been *radix ecclesie catholice*, root of the catholic church of Christ, I would fain know how St. Cyprian, so great and famous an assertor of the church's unity, durst once so much as think of suspending communion with her. Thirdly, because this sense will be plain also by other passages out of other epistles of St. Cyprian. For writing to Jubaianus an African bishop against the Novatians, who then infested those parts, and durst rebaptize catholic Christians, he saith thus: “<sup>e</sup>But we, who hold the head and root of one church, do know for certain, and believe, that nothing of this is lawful out of the catholic church; and that of baptism, which is but one, we are the head, where he himself was at first baptized, when he held the ground and verity of divine unity.” Now I conceive it is all one, or at least as argumentative to all purposes, to be *caput* or *radix baptismatis*, head or root of baptism, as head or root

<sup>d</sup> Baron. Annal. 254. num. 64, where he cites this epistle.

<sup>e</sup> Nos autem qui ecclesie unius caput et radicem tenemus, pro certo scimus, et credimus, nihil extra ecclesiam licere,

et baptismatis quod est unum caput nos esse ubi et ipse baptizatus prius fuerat, quando divine unitatis, et rationem et veritatem tenebat. S. Cypr. ad Jubaian. epist. 73. edit. Pamel.



of the church; for there is but one baptism, as well as but one church, and that is the entrance into this. And St. Cyprian affirms and includes himself, *nos esse caput*, that we are the head of baptism. Where yet (I pray observe it) he cannot by *nos*, we, mean his own person, (though if he did, he were the more opposite to Rome;) much less can he mean the Roman church, as it is a particular, and stands separate from others: for then how could he say *nos esse caput*, that we are the head? Therefore he must needs mean the unity and society of the church catholic, which the Novatians had then left, and whereof he and his church were still members. Besides, most manifest it is, that he calls that church *caput baptismatis*, the head of baptism, where Novatian was baptized; (they are his own words;) and probable it is that was Rome, because that schismatic was a Roman priest. And yet for all this St. Cyprian says, *Nos esse caput baptismatis*, that we are the head of baptism, though he were at Carthage. By which it is plain, that as *caput* is parallel to *radix* and *matrix*, so also that by *caput*, the head of baptism, he includes, together with Rome, all the other members of the church universal. Again: St. Cyprian writes to Cornelius and censures the schismatical carriage of the Novatians at Rome. And tells him further, that he had sent Caldonius and Fortunatus to “labour peace in that church, that so they might be reduced to, and composed in the unity of the catholic church. But because the obstinate and inflexible pertinacy of the other party had not only refused *radicis et matris sinum*, the bosom of their mother and embracings of their root, but the schism increasing and growing raw to the worse, hath set up a bishop to itself,” &c. Where it is observable, and I think plain, that St. Cyprian employed his legates, not to bring the catholic church to the communion of Rome, but Rome to the catholic church. Or to bring the Novatians not only to communicate with Cornelius, but with the church universal, which was therefore head and root in St. Cyprian’s judgment, even to Rome itself, as well as to all other, great, ancient, or even apostolical

f Elaborarent ut ad catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent, et Christianæ charitatis vinculum copularent. Sed quoniam diversæ partis obstinata et inflexibilis

pertinacia non tantum radicis et matris sinum atque complexum recusavit, sed etiam gliscente et in pejus recrudescente discordia, episcopum sibi constituit, &c. S. Cypriani lib. ii. epist. 10.

Sect. 38. churches. And this is yet more plain by the sequel; for when those his legates had laboured to bring those schismatics to the unity of the catholic church, yet he complains their labour was lost. And why? Why! because *recusabant radicis et matris sinum*, they refused the bosom of the root and the mother. Therefore it must needs be, that in St. Cyprian's sense these two, *unitas catholice ecclesie*, the unity of the catholic church, and *radicis*, or *matricis sinus*, or *complexus*, the bosom, or embracing of the root or the mother, are all one. And then *radix* and *matrix* are not words by which he expresses the Roman see in particular, but he denotes by them the unity of the church catholic. Fourthly, because Tertullian § seems to me to agree in the same sense. For, saith he, "these so many and great churches founded by the apostles, taken all of them together, are that one church from the apostles, out of which are all. So all are first, and all apostolic, while they all allow and prove *unam unitatem*, one unity." Nor can any possibly understand this of any particular church, but subordinately. As St. Gregory Nazianzen says the church of Cæsarea was <sup>h</sup>*mater*, the mother of almost all churches; which must needs be understood of some neighbouring churches, not of the whole catholic church. And where <sup>i</sup>Pamelius speaks of original and mother-churches, he names six and others, and Rome in the last place. Therefore certainly no particular church can be the root or matrix of the catholic; but she is rooted in her own unity, down from the apostles, and nowhere else *extra Deum*. And this is further manifest by the irreligious act of the emperor Adrian. For he, intending to root out the faith of Christ, took this course: he consecrated *simulachrum Jovis*, the image of Jupiter in the very place where Christ suffered, and profaned Bethlehem with the temple of Adonis: "<sup>k</sup>to this end, that

§ Tot ac tantæ ecclesie, una est illa ab apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ, et omnes apostolicæ, dum unam omnes probant unitatem. Tertull. de Præsc. advers. Hæ. cap. 20.—Perro unam esse primam apostolicam; ex qua reliquæ. Hanc nulli loco affigit B. Rhemanus Annet. in Argumento, Tertull. de Præscript. &c. Nulli loco. Therefore not at Rome. But these words, Hanc nulli loco affigit, deletantur, says the Spanish inquisition

upon Rhemanus, printed at Madrid, anno 1584.

<sup>h</sup> Greg. Nazian. says the church of Cæsarea was mater prope omnium ecclesiarum. Epist. 18.

<sup>i</sup> Pamel. in Tertull. de Præscript. advers. Hæres. cap. 21. num. 129.

<sup>k</sup> Ut quasi radix et fundamentum ecclesie tolleretur, si in iis locis idola colerentur in quibus Christus natus est, &c. S. Paulinus Epist. 11. ad Severum.

the root, as it were, and the foundation of the church might be taken away, if in those places idols might be worshipped, in which Christ himself was born and suffered," &c. By which it is most evident, that either Jerusalem was the root of the catholic church, if any particular church were so; or rather, that Adrian was deceived, (as being an heathen he well might,) in that he thought the universal church had any particular or local root of its being; or that he could destroy it all by laying it waste in any one place whatsoever. And St. Augustine, I think, is full for this, that the catholic church must have a catholic root or matrix too. For <sup>l</sup>he tells us, "That all heresies whatsoever went out *de illa*, out of the catholic church;" for *de illa* there can be out of no other. For all heresies did not go out of any one particular church. He goes on: "They were cut off *de vite*, from this catholic vine still, as unprofitable branches; *ipsa autem*, but this catholic church remains *in radice sua*, in its own root, in its own vine, in its own charity," which must needs be as ample and as catholic as itself. Or else, were it any particular, all heretical branches could not be cut off from one root." And St. Augustine says again, "<sup>m</sup>That the Donatists did not consider that they were cut off from the root of the eastern churches:" Where you see again, it is still but one root of many churches: and that if any man will have a particular root of the catholic church, he must have it in the East, not in the West at Rome. And now lastly, besides this out of St. Cyprian to prove his own meaning, (and sure he is the best interpreter of himself,) and other assisting proofs, it is most evident, that in the prime and principal sense, the catholic church and her unity is the head, root, or matrix of Rome, and all other particular churches; and not Rome, or any other particular, the head, root, or matrix of it. For there is a double root of the church, as there is of all things else; that is, *radix essentie*. the root, head, or matrix of its essence: and this is the prime sense; for essence and being is first in all things. And then

<sup>l</sup> Hæreses omnes de illa exierunt tanquam sarmenta inutilia de vite præcisa: ipsa autem manet in radice sua, &c. S. August. de Symb. ad Catechumen. lib. i. cap. 6.

<sup>m</sup> Pars Donati non considerat se præcisam esse a radice orientalium ecclesiarum, &c. S. August. Epist. 170. prin.

Sect. 38. there is *radix existentia*, the root of its existence and formal being, which always presupposes being, and is therefore a senseless principal. Now to apply this. The catholic or universal church is, and must needs be, the root of essence and being to Rome and all other particulars. And this is the principal root, head, or matrix, that gives being. And Rome, but with all other particular churches, and no more than other patriarchal churches, was and is *radix existentia*, the root of the church's existence. And this agrees with that known and received rule in art; That universals give essence to their particulars, and particulars supply their universals with existence. For as Socrates and every particular man borrow their essence from the species and definition of a man, which is universal; but this universal nature and being of man hath no actual existence, but in Socrates and all other particular men; so the church of Rome, and every other particular church in the world, receive their very essence and being of a church from the definition of the catholic universal church of Christ: but this universal nature and being of the church hath no actual existence but in Rome and all other particular churches, and equal existence in all her particulars. And should all the particular churches in the world fall away from Christ, save only one, (which God forbid;) yet the nature, essence, and being of the universal church, would both exist and subsist in that one particular. Out of all which to me most clear it is, that for the church's being, the catholic church, and that in unity (for *ens et unum*, being, and being one, are convertible) is *radix*, the root, head, matrix, fountain, or original (call it what you will) of Rome and all other particular churches. But Rome is no more than other churches the root or matrix of the catholic church's existence, or place of her actual residence. And this I say for her existence only, not the purity or form of her existence, which is not here considered. But if the catholic she be not, nor the root of the catholic church, yet apostolic I hope she is. Indeed apostolic she is, as being the see <sup>n</sup> of one, and he a prime

<sup>n</sup> Not as Bellarmine would have it, with a "Hinc dicitur apostolica, quia in ea successio episcoporum ab apostolis deducta est usque ad nos." Bellarm. de

Notis Eccl. lib. iv. cap. 8. §. 1. For by this reason, neither Jerusalem nor Antioch were in their times apostolic churches: because succession of bishops

apostle: but then not apostolic, as the church is called in the Creed, from all the apostles; no, nor the <sup>o</sup>only apostolic. Visible, I may not deny, God hath hitherto preserved her, but for a better end, doubtless, than they turn it to; but infallible she was never. Yet if that lady did as the Jesuit in his close avows, or others will rest satisfied with it, who can help it? Sure, none but God. And, by A. C.'s leave, this (which I said is no work for my pen) cannot be learned; no, not of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church, much less of the Roman. For though the foundation be one and the same, and sufficiently known by scripture and the Creeds, yet for the building upon the foundation, the adding to it, the detracting from it, the joining other things with it, the grating upon it, each of these may be damnable to some and not to others, according to the knowledge, wisdom, means of information, which some have and others want; and according to the ignorance, simplicity, and want of information, which some others have and cannot help; and according to the negligence, contempt, wilfulness, and malice, with obstinacy, which some have against the known truth. And all, or some of these, in different degrees, in every particular man; and that in the whole latitude of mankind, from the most wise and learned in the school of Christ, to the simplest idiot, that hath been so happy as to be initiated into the faith by baptism. Now the church hath not this knowledge of all particulars, men, and conditions; nor can she apply the conditions to the men, and therefore cannot teach just how far every man must believe, as it relates to the possibility or impossibility of his salvation in every particular. And that which the church

Sect. 38.

hath not succeeded in them to this day. De collegis agebatur qui possent, &c. judicio apostolicarum ecclesiarum causam suam integram reservare. S. August. Epist. 162.—Jo. de Turrecrem. enumerat sex verbi hujus significationes. Quarum prima est: Apostolica dicitur quia in apostolis, &c. initiata est. Hos enim instituit quasi fundamentum ecclesie, &c. Jo. de Turrecrem. Summæ lib. i. cap. 18. Et quia originem sumpsit ab apostolis, &c. Ibid. Ubi dicit etiam S. patres apposuisse hanc vocem *apostolicam* in simbolo suo, supra symbolum apostolorum. Ibid.

o Ecclesie apostolicæ, ut Smyræorum.

et reliquæ ab apostolis fundatæ. Tertull. de Præscript. advers. Hæret. cap. 32. Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, &c. Habes Corinthum, Philippos, Thessalonicenses, Ephesum, Romam. Ibid. cap. 32.—Et Pamelius enumerat Hierosolymitanam, Antiochenam, Corinthiam, Philippensem, Ephesinam, Romanam. Pamel. ibid. cap. 21. num. 129. And it may be observed, that so long ago Tertullian, and so lately Pamelius, should reckon Rome last. Quin et alie ecclesie quæ ab his apostolicæ etiam deputantur, ut soboles ecclesiarum apostolicarum, &c. Tertull. ibid. cap. 20.



Sect 38, 39. cannot teach, men cannot learn of her. She can teach the foundation, and men were happy if they would learn it, and the church more happy would she teach nothing but that as necessary to salvation; for certainly, nothing but that is necessary. Now then, whereas, after all this, the Jesuit tells us, that,

¶ Upon this and the precedent conferences, the lady rested in judgment fully satisfied (as she told a confident friend) of the truth of the Roman church's faith: yet, upon frailty, and fear to offend the king, she yielded to go to church; for which she was after very sorry, as some of her friends can testify.

Sect. 39. **B.** I.—This is all personal. And how that honourable lady was then settled in conscience, how in judgment, I know not. This, I think, is made clear enough, that that which you said in this and the precedent conferences could settle neither, unless in some that were settled or settling before. As little do I know what she told any confident friend of her approving the Roman cause; no more whether it were frailty or fear, or other motive, that made her yield to go to church; nor how sorry she was for it, nor who can testify that sorrow. This I am sure of, if she repent, and God forgive her other sins, she will more easily be able to answer for her coming to church, than for her leaving of the church of England, and following the superstitions and errors which the Roman church hath added in point of faith and the worship of God. For the lady was then living when I answered thus.

A. C. p. 73.

II.—Now whereas I said, the lady would far more easily be able to answer for her coming to church than for her leaving the church of England; to this A. C. excepts, and says, “That I neither prove nor can prove, that it is lawful for one (persuaded especially as the lady was) to go to the protestant church.” There is a great deal of cunning and as much malice in this passage, but I shall easily pluck the sting out of the tail of this wasp. And first, I have proved it already through this whole discourse, and therefore can prove it, that the church of England is an orthodox church; and therefore with the same labour it is proved, that men may lawfully go unto it and communicate with it; for so a man not only may

A. C. p. 73.

but ought to do with an orthodox church. And a Romanist Sect. 39.  
may communicate with the church of England without any offence in the nature of the thing thereby incurred. But if his conscience through misinformation check it, he should do well in that case rather to inform his conscience than forsake any orthodox church whatsoever. Secondly, A. C. tells me plainly, "That I cannot prove that a man so persuaded as the lady was may go to the protestant church;" that is, that a Roman catholic may not go to the protestant church. Why, I never went about to prove that a Roman catholic, being and continuing such, might, against his conscience, go to the protestant church. For these words, "a man persuaded as the lady is," are A. C.'s words, they are not mine. Mine are not simply that the lady might, or that she might not; but comparative they are, that she might more easily answer to God for coming to than for going from the church of England. And that is every way most true. For in this doubtful time of hers, when, upon my reasons given, she went again to church; when yet soon after (as you say, at least) she was sorry for it; I say, at this time she was in heart and resolution a Roman catholic, or she was not: if she were not, (as it seems by her doubting she was not then fully resolved,) then my speech is most true, that she might more easily answer to God for coming to service in the church of England than for leaving it; for a protestant she had been, and for aught I knew, at the end of this conference so she was; and then it was no sin in itself to come to an orthodox church; nor no sin against her conscience, she continuing a protestant, for aught which then appeared to me. But if she then were a Roman catholic, (as the Jesuit and A. C. seem confident she was,) yet my speech is true too. For then she might more easily answer to God for coming to the church of England, which is orthodox, and leaving the church of Rome, which is superstitious, than by leaving the church of England, communicate with all the superstitions of Rome. Now the cunning and the malignity of A. C. lies in this: he would fain have the world think that I am so indifferent in religion as that I did maintain, the lady, being conscientiously persuaded of the truth of the Romish doctrine, might yet, against both her

Sect. 39. conscience and against open and avowed profession, come to the protestant church.

III.—Nevertheless, in hope his cunning malice would not be discovered, against this (his own sense that is, and not mine) he brings divers reasons. As first, it is not lawful for one affected as that lady was; that is, for one that is resolved of the truth of the Roman church, to go to the church of England, there and in that manner to serve and worship God; “because,” saith A. C., “that were to halt on both sides, to serve two masters, and to dissemble with God and the world.” Truly, I say the same thing with him, and that therefore neither may a protestant, that is resolved in conscience that the profession of the true faith is in the church of England, go to the Romish church, there and in that manner to serve and worship God. Neither need I give other answer, because A. C. urges this against his own fiction, not my assertion. Yet since he will so do, I shall give a particular answer to each of them. And to this first reason of his I say thus, That to believe religion after one sort and to practise it after another, and that in the main points of worship, the sacrament and invocation, is to halt on both sides, to serve two masters, and to dissemble with God and the world. And other than this I never taught, nor ever said that which might infer the contrary. But, A. C., give me leave to tell you, your fellow Jesuit <sup>p</sup> Azorius affirms this in express terms; and what do you think, can he prove it? Nay, not Azorius only, but other priests and Jesuits here in England, either teach some of their proselytes, or else some of them learn it without teaching, that though they be persuaded as this lady was, that is, though they be Roman catholics, yet

<sup>p</sup> Quinto quaeritur, An ubi catholici una cum hæreticis versantur, licitum sit catholico adire templa ad quæ hæretici conveniunt, eorum interesse conventibus, &c. Respondeo: Si rei naturam spectemus, non est per se malum, sed sua natura indifferens, &c. Et postea: Si princeps hæresi laboret, et jubeat subditos catholicos sub pena mortis, vel confiscationis bonorum frequentare templa hæreticorum, quid tum faciendum? Respondeo: Si jubeat tantum, ut omnes mandato suo obediant, licitum est catholicis facere: quia præstant solum obedientiæ officium. Sin jubeat, ut eo symbolo simul religionem hæreticam profiteantur, parere non debent. Quæres iterum, An liceat catholico obedire, modo publice asseverat se id efficere, solum ut principi suo obediat, non ut sectam hæreticam profiteatur? Respondeo: Quidam id licere arbitrantur, ne bona ejus publicentur, vel vita cripiatur. Quod sane probabiliter dici videtur. Azorius Institut. Moral. p. i. lib. viii. c. 27. p. 1299. edit. Paris. 1616.

either to gain honour or save their purse, they may go to the protestant church, just as the Jesuit here says “the lady did out of frailty and fear to offend the king.” Therefore I pray A. C., if this be gross dissimulation both with God and the world, speak to your fellows to leave persuading or practising of it, and leave men in the profession of religion to be as they seem, or to seem and appear as they are; let us have no mask worn here. A. C.’s second reason why one so persuaded as that lady was might not go to the protestant church is, A. C. p. 73. “Because that were outwardly to profess a religion in conscience known to be false.” To this I answer, first, that if this reason be true, it concerns all men, as well as those that be persuaded as the lady was; for no man may outwardly profess a religion in conscience known to be false; *for with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth he confesseth to salvation*<sup>q</sup>. Now to his own salvation no man can confess a known false religion. Secondly, if the religion of the protestants be in conscience a known false religion, then the Romanists’ religion is so too, for their religion is the same: nor do the church of Rome and the protestants set up a different religion, (for the Christian religion is the same to both,) but they differ in the same religion: and the difference is in certain gross corruptions, to the very endangering of salvation; which each side says the other is guilty of. Thirdly, the reason given is most untrue; for it may appear by all the former discourse to any indifferent reader, that religion, as it is professed in the church of England, is nearest of any church now in being to the primitive church; and therefore not a religion known to be false. And this I both do and can prove, were not the deafness of this asp<sup>r</sup> upon the ears of seduced Christians in all human and divided parties whatsoever.

IV.—After these reasons thus given by him, A. C. tells me, “That I neither do nor can prove any superstition or error to be in the Roman <sup>s</sup>religion.” What, none at all? Now truly, I would to God from my heart this were true, and that the church of Rome were so happy, and the whole catholic church thereby blessed with truth and peace: for I

<sup>q</sup> Rom. x. 10.

<sup>r</sup> Psal. lviii. 4.

<sup>s</sup> I would A. C. would call it the Roman persuasion, as some understanding Romanists do.

Sect. 39. am confident such truth as that would soon either command peace or 'confound peacebreakers. But is there no superstition in adoration of images? none in invocation of saints? none in adoration of the sacrament? Is there no error in breaking Christ's own institution of the sacrament, by giving it but in one kind? none about purgatory? about common prayer in an unknown tongue, none? These and many more are in the Roman religion, (if you will needs call it so.) And it is no hard work to prove every of these to be error or superstition, or both. But if A. C. think so meanly of me, that though this be no hard work in itself, yet that I (such is my weakness) cannot prove it, I shall leave him to enjoy that opinion of me, or whatever else he shall be pleased to entertain; and am far better content with his opinion of my

A. C. p. 73. weakness, than with that which follows of my pride: for he adds, "That I cannot prove any error or superstition to be in the Roman religion, but by presuming with intolerable pride to make myself or some of my fellows to be judge of controversies; and by taking authority to censure all to be superstition and error too, which suits not with my fancy, although it be generally held or practised by the universal church; which," saith he, "in St. Augustine's judgment, is most insolent madness." What! not prove any superstition, any error at Rome but by pride, and that intolerable! Truly, I would to God A. C. saw my heart, and all the pride that lodges therein. But wherein doth this pride appear, that he censures me so deeply? Why first, in this; that "I cannot prove any error or superstition to be in the Roman religion, unless I make myself or some of my fellows judge of controversies." Indeed, if I took this upon me, I were guilty of great pride: but A. C. knows well that before in this conference, which he undertakes to answer, I am so far from making myself or any of my fellows judge of controversies, that <sup>u</sup>I absolutely make a lawful and free general council judge of controversies, by and according to

<sup>t</sup> For though I spare their names, yet can I not agree in judgment with him that says in print, "God be praised for the disagreement in religion;" nor in devotion with him that prayed in the pulpit, "That God would tear the rent of religion wider:" but of St. Gre-

gory Nazianzen's opinion I am. *Ὅστε εἰρηνεύομεν*, &c. Non studemus paci in detrimentum veræ doctriinæ—ut facilitatis et mansuetudinis famam colligamus.—Et rursum: Pacem colimus legitime pugnantes, &c. Orat. 32.

<sup>u</sup> Sect. 33. Sect. 26. num. I. XI.



the scriptures. And this I learned from <sup>x</sup>St. Augustine, with Sect. 39. this, "That ever the scripture is to have the prerogative above the council." Nay, A. C. should remember here that <sup>y</sup>he himself taxes me for giving too much power to a general council, and binding men to a strict obedience to it, even in case of error; and therefore sure most innocent I am of the most intolerable pride which he is pleased to charge upon me: and he of all men most unfit to charge it. Secondly, A. C. <sup>A. C. p. 73.</sup> will have my pride appear in this, that I take authority to censure all for error and superstition which suits not with my own fancy. But how can this possibly be, since I submit my judgment in all humility to the scripture, interpreted by the primitive church, and upon new and necessary doubts to the judgment of a lawful and free general council? And this I do from my very heart, and do abhor in matters of religion that my own or any private man's fancy should take any place; and least of all against things generally held or practised by the universal church; which to oppose in such things is certainly (as <sup>z</sup>St. Augustine calls it) *insolentissimæ insanix*, an attempt of most insolent madness. But those things which the church of England charges upon the Roman party to be superstitious and erroneous, are not held or practised in or by the universal church generally, either for time or place. And now I would have A. C. consider, how justly all this may be turned upon himself: for he hath nothing to pretend, that there are not gross superstitions and errors in the Roman persuasion; unless by intolerable pride he will make himself and his party judge of controversies, (as in effect he doth; for he will be judged by none but the pope, and a council of his ordering;) or unless he will take authority to free from superstition and error whatsoever suits with his fancy, though it be even superstition itself, and run cross to what hath been generally held in the catholic church of Christ; yea, though to do so be, in St. Augustine's judgment, most insolent madness. And A. C. spake in this most properly, when he called it *taking of authority*: for the bishop and church of Rome have, in this particular of judging controversies, indeed taken that authority to themselves, which

<sup>x</sup> Præponitur scriptura, &c. S. August. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. ii. c. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 32. num. V. A. C. p. 63.

<sup>z</sup> S. August. Epist. 118. c. 5.

Sect. 39. neither Christ nor his church catholic did ever give them. Here the conference ended with this conclusion.

V.—And as I hope God hath given that lady mercy, so I heartily pray that he will be pleased to give all of you a light of his truth, and a love to it, that you may no longer be made instruments of the pope's boundless ambition, and this most unchristian <sup>a</sup>brain-sick device, that in all controversies of the faith he is infallible, and that by way of inspiration and prophecy, in the conclusion which he gives. To the due consideration of which, and God's mercy in Christ, I leave you.

VI.—To this conclusion of the conference between me and the Jesuit, A. C. says not much; but that which he doth say is either the selfsame which he hath said already, or else is quite mistaken in the business. That which he hath  
A. C. p. 73. said already is this; "That in matters of faith, we are to submit our judgments to such doctors and pastors, as by visible, continual succession without change brought the faith down from Christ and his apostles to these our days, and shall so carry it to the end of the world; and that this succession is not found in any other church differing in doctrine from the Roman church." Now to this I have given a full answer <sup>b</sup>already, and therefore will not trouble the reader with needless and troublesome repetition. Then he brings certain places of scripture to prove the pope's infallibility: but to all these places I have likewise answered <sup>c</sup>before; and therefore A. C. needed not to repeat them again, as if they had been unanswerable.

VII.—One place of scripture only A. C. had not urged before, either for proof of this continued visible succession,  
A. C. p. 73. or for the pope's infallibility: nor doth A. C. distinctly set down by which of the two he will prove it. The place is<sup>d</sup>—*Christ ascending gave some to be apostles; some, prophets; some, evangelists; some, pastors and teachers, &c. for the edification of the church.* Now if he do mean to prove the pope's infallibility by this place in his pastoral judgment, truly I do not see how this can possibly be collected thence: <sup>e</sup>Christ gave

<sup>a</sup> Sect. 33. num. VI.

<sup>b</sup> Sect. 37. num. III, IV.

<sup>c</sup> Sect. 25. num. V.

<sup>d</sup> Ephes. iv. 11.

<sup>e</sup> Pontificatus summus disertè positus est ab apostolo in illis verbis, Ephes. iv.

some to be apostles for the edification of his church: therefore Sect. 39. St. Peter and all his successors are infallible in their pastoral judgment; and if he mean to prove the continued visible succession, which he saith is to be found in no church but the Roman, there is a little more show, but to no more purpose. A little more show: because it is added, <sup>f</sup>verse 13, that the apostles and prophets, &c. shall continue at their work (and that must needs be by succession) till we all meet in unity and perfection of Christ: but to no purpose; for it is not said that they or their successors should continue at this work in a personal uninterrupted succession in any one particular church, Roman or other. Nor ever will A. C. be able to prove that such a succession is necessary in any one particular place; and if he could, yet his own words tell us the A. C. p. 73. personal succession is nothing, “if the faith be not brought down without change from Christ and his apostles to this day, and so to the end of the world.” Now here is a piece of cunning too, the faith brought down unchanged; for if A. C. mean by the faith the Creed, and that in letter, it is true the church of Rome hath received and brought down the faith unchanged from Christ and his apostles to these our days. But then it is apparently false that no church differing from the Roman in doctrine hath kept that faith unchanged, and that by a visible and continued succession: for the Greek church differs from the Roman in doctrine, and yet hath so kept that faith unchanged. But if he mean by the faith unchanged, and yet brought down in a continual visible succession, not only the Creed in letter, but in sense too; and not that only, but all the doctrinal points about the faith which have been determined in all such councils, as the pre-

11. et in illis clarioribus, 1 Cor. xii. 28. Ipse posuit in ecclesia primum apostolos, &c. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. i. c. 1. §. Respondeo pontificatum. And he gives an excellent reason for it: Si quidem summa potestas ecclesiastica non solum data est Petro, sed etiam aliis apostolis. Ibid. So belike by this reason the apostle doth clearly express the popedom, because all the rest of the apostles had as much ecclesiastical power as St. Peter had. But then Bel-

larmine would salve it up with this, that this power is given Petro, ut ordinario pastori cui succederetur, aliis vero tanquam delegatis, quibus non succederetur. Ibid. But this is mere begging of the question, and will never be granted unto him: and in the mean time we have his absolute confession for the other, That the supreme ecclesiastical power was not in St. Peter alone, but in all the apostles.

<sup>f</sup> Ephes. iv. 13.

Sect. 39. sent church of Rome allows, (as most certainly he doth so mean, and it is the controversy between us;) then it is most certain and most apparent to any understanding man that reads antiquity with an impartial eye, that a visible continua succession of doctors and pastors have not brought down the faith in this sense from Christ and his apostles to these days of ours in the Roman church. And that I might not be thought to say and not to prove, I give instance. And with this, that if A. C. or any Jesuit can prove, that by a visible continued succession from Christ and his apostles to this day, either transubstantiation in the eucharist, or the eucharist in one kind, or purgatory, or worship of images, or the intention of the priest of necessity in baptism, or the power of the pope over a general council, or his infallibility with or without it, or his power to depose princes, or the public prayers of the church in an unknown tongue, with divers other points have been so taught, I for my part will give the cause. Besides, for succession in the general I shall say this; it is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession, a necessary sign or mark of the true church in any one place. And where <sup>h</sup>Vincentius Lirinensis calls for antiquity, universality, and consent, as great notes of truth, he hath not one word of succession. And for that great place in <sup>i</sup>Irenæus, where that ancient Father reckons the succession of the bishops of Rome to Eleutherius, (who sat in his time,) and saith, “That this is a most full and ample proof or ostension, *vivificatricem fidem*, that the living and life-giving faith is from the apostles to this day conserved and delivered in truth;” and of which place <sup>k</sup>Bellarmino boasts so much. Most mani-

<sup>g</sup> And so also Bellarmine, *Sexta nota est conspiratio in doctrina cum ecclesia antiqua. De Notis Eccles. lib. iv. c. 9. §. 1.*

<sup>h</sup> Vin. Lirin. cont. Hær. c. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Hac ordinatione et successione ea quæ est ab apostolis in ecclesia traditio, et veritatis præconiatio pervenit usque ad nos. Et est plenissima hæc ostensio, unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem

esse, quæ in ecclesia ab apostolis usque nunc sit conservata, et tradita in veritate. Iren. advers. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Per hanc successionem confundi omnes hæreticos. Bellarm. de Notis Eccles. lib. iv. c. 8. §. 1. There is no such word found in Irenæus as *per hanc successionem*, or *hac successione*, in the church of Rome only, which is Bellarmine's sense: but by succession

fest it is in the very same place, that “<sup>l</sup>Irenæus stood as Sect. 39. much upon the succession of the churches then in Asia, and of Smyrna (though that no prime apostolical church) where Polycarpus sat bishop, as of the succession at Rome;” by which it is most manifest that it is not personal succession only, and that tied to one place, that the Fathers meant, but they taught that the faith was delivered over by succession in some places or other still to their present time; and so doubtless shall be, till time be no more. I say, the faith; but not every opinion, true or false, that in tract of time shall cleave to the faith. And to the faith itself, and all its fundamentals, we can shew as good and full a succession as you; and we pretend no otherwise to it than you do, save that we take in the Greeks, which you do not. Only we reject your gross superstitions, to which you can shew no succession from the apostles, either at Rome or elsewhere, much less any one uninterrupted. And therefore he might have held his peace that says, “It is evident that the Roman catholic church only hath had a constant and uninterrupted succession of pastors, and doctors, and tradition of doctrine from age to age.” For most evident it is, that the tradition of doctrine hath received both addition and alteration since the first five hundred years, in which <sup>m</sup>Bellarmino confesses and bishop Jewel maintains the church’s doctrine was apostolical.

VIII.—And once more before I leave this point. Most evident it is that the succession which the Fathers meant is not tied to place or person, but it is tied to the verity of doctrine: for so <sup>n</sup>Tertullian expressly; “Beside the order of bishops running down (in succession) from the beginning, there is required *consanguinitas doctrinæ*, that the doctrine be allied in

in general in other churches, as well as in Rome.

<sup>l</sup> Testimonium his perhibent quantum in Asia ecclesiæ omnes, et qui usque adhuc successerunt Polycarpo. Iren. advers. Hæres. lib. iii. c. 3.—Constat omnem doctrinam quæ cum illis ecclesiis apostolicis, matricibus, originalibus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam. Tertull. de Præscript. advers. Hæretic. c. 21.—Ecclesiæ posteriores non minus apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinæ. Ibid. c. 32.—Ecclesia non in parietibus consistit, &c.

Ecclesia autem illie erat, ubi fides vera erat. S. Hieron. in Psal. cxxxiii.

<sup>m</sup> Antiqua ecclesia primis quingentis annis vera ecclesia fuit, et proinde apostolicam doctrinam retinuit. Bellarmino. de Notis Eccles. lib. iv. c. 9. §. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ad hanc formam provocabuntur ab illis vera ecclesia, quæ licet nullum ex apostolis, vel apostolicis authorem suum proferunt, ut multo posteriores quæ denique quotidie instituuntur, tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinæ. Tertull. de Præscript. c. 32.



Sect. 39. blood to that of Christ and his apostles." So that if the doctrine be no kin to Christ, all the succession become strangers, what nearness soever they pretend. And <sup>o</sup>Irenæus speaks plainer than he; "We are to obey those presbyters which, together with the succession of their bishoprics, have received *charisma veritatis*, the gift of truth." Now Stapleton, being pressed hard with these two authorities, first <sup>p</sup>confesses expressly, "That succession, as it is a note of the true church, is neither a succession in place only, nor person only, but it must be of true and sound doctrine also:" and had he stayed here, no man could have said better; but then he saw well he must quit his great note of the church-succession; that he durst not do: therefore he begins to cast about how he may answer these Fathers, and yet maintain succession. Secondly, therefore, he tells us, that that which these Fathers say do nothing weaken succession, but that it shall still be a main note of the true church, and in that sense which he would have it; and his reason is, "<sup>q</sup>Because sound doctrine is indivisible from true and lawful succession:" where you shall see this great clerk (for so he was) not able to stand to himself when he hath forsaken truth: for it is not long after that he tells us that the people are led along, and judge the doctrine by the pastors; but when the church comes to examine, she judges the pastors by their doctrine; and this <sup>r</sup>he says is necessary, "because a man may become of a pastor, a wolf." Now then let Stapleton take his choice; for either a pastor in this succession cannot become a wolf, and then this proposition is false; or else if he can, then sound doctrine is not inseparable from true and legitimate succession: and then the former proposition is false, as indeed it is. For that a good pastor may become a wolf, is no news in the ancient story of the church, in which are registered the change of many <sup>s</sup>great men into heretics: I spare their names: and since <sup>t</sup>Judas changed from an

<sup>o</sup> Illis presbyteris obediendum est, qui cum episcopatus successione charisma acceperunt veritatis. Iren. lib. iv. cap. 43.

<sup>p</sup> Successio nec locorum tantum est, nec personarum, sed etiam veræ et sanæ doctrinæ. Stapl. Relect. Controvers. 1. q. 4. A. 2. notab. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Quia doctrina sana est ab ipsa vera et legitima successione indivulsa. Stapl. ibid.

<sup>r</sup> Nam e pastore lupus fieri potest. Stapl. ibid. notab. 4.

<sup>s</sup> Vincent. Lir. cont. Hær. c. 23, 24.

<sup>t</sup> John vi. 70.

apostle to a devil, it is no wonder to see others change from Sect. 39. shepherds into wolves. I doubt the church is not empty of such changelings at this day. Yea, but Stapleton will help all this; for he adds, "That suppose the pastors do forsake true doctrine, yet succession shall still be a true note of the church; yet not every succession, but that which is legitimate and true." Well; and what is that? Why, "u That succession is lawful which is of those pastors which hold entire the unity and the faith." Where you may see this Sampson's hair cut off again; for at his word I will take him. And if that only be a legitimate succession which holds the unity and the faith entire, then the succession of pastors in the Roman church is illegitimate; for they have had x more schisms among them than any other church; therefore they have not kept the unity of the church. And they have brought in gross superstition; therefore they have not kept the faith entire. Now if A. C. have any mind to it, he may do well to help Stapleton out of these briers, upon which he hath torn his creed, and, I doubt, his conscience too, to uphold the corruptions of the see of Rome.

IX.—As for that in which he is quite mistaken, it is his inference, which is this, "That I should therefore consider carefully whether it be not more Christian and less brainsick to think that the pope, being St. Peter's successor, with a general council, should be judge of controversies, &c.; and that the pastoral judgment of him should be accounted infallible, rather than to make every man that can read the scripture interpreter of scripture, decider of controversies, controller of general councils, and judge of his judges; or to have no judge at all of controversies of faith, but permit every man to believe as he list, as if there were no infallible certainty of faith to be expected on earth; which were, instead of one saving faith, to induce a Babylonical confusion of so many faiths as fancies, or no true Christian faith at all; from which evils, sweet Jesus, deliver us!" I have considered of these very carefully; but this inference supposes that which I never granted, nor any protestant that I yet know, namely,

u Legitima autem est illorum pastorum, qui unitatem tenent et fidem. Stapl. *ibid.* notab. 5.

x In their own chronologer Onuphrius, there are thirty acknowledged.

Sect. 39. that if I deny the pope to be judge of controversies, I must by and by either leave this supreme judicature in the hands and power of every private man that can but read the scripture, or else allow no judge at all, and so let in all manner of confusion. No, God forbid that I should grant either; for I have expressly <sup>y</sup>declared, that the scripture interpreted by the primitive church, and a lawful and free general council, determining according to these, is judge of controversies; and that no private man whatsoever is or can be judge of these. Therefore A. C. is quite mistaken, (and I pray God it be not wilfully, to beguile poor ladies, and other their weak adherents, with seeming to say somewhat,) I say quite mistaken, to infer that I am either for a private judge, or for no judge; for I utterly disclaim both, and that as much, if not more than he, or any Romanist, whoever he be. But these things in this passage I cannot swallow: first, that the pope, with a general council, should be judge; for the pope in ancient councils never had more power than any of the other patriarchs: precedency, perhaps for order's sake, and other respects, he had. Nor had the pope any negative voice against the rest in point of difference; <sup>z</sup>no, nor was he held superior to the council: therefore the ancient church never accounted or admitted him a judge; no, not with a council, much less without it. Secondly, it will not down with me that his pastoral judgment should be infallible, especially since some of them have been as <sup>a</sup>ignorant as many that can but read the scripture. Thirdly, I cannot admit this neither, (though he do most cunningly thereby abuse his readers,) that any thing hath been said by me out of which it can justly be inferred that there is no infallible certainty of faith to be expected on

<sup>y</sup> Sect. 26. num. I.

<sup>z</sup> Patrum et avorum nostrorum tempore, pauci audebant dicere, Papam esse supra concilium. Æneas Sylvius, seu Pius II. de Gestis Concil. Basil. lib. i. Et illud imprimis cupio notum, quia Romanum papam, omnes qui aliquo numero sunt, concilio subjeiciunt. Ibid. in fascic. rerum Expetend. fol. 5.—Nunc autem, Papam esse non solum supra concilium generale, sed et universam ecclesiam, est propositio fere de fide. Bellarini. de Concil. lib. ii. c. 17. §. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Quum hoc tempore nullus sit

Romæ (ut fama est) qui sacras literas didicerit, qua fronte aliquis eorum docere audebit, quod non didicerit? Arnulph. in Concil. Rhemensi.—Nam cum constat plures eorum adeo illiteratos esse, ut grammaticam penitus ignorarent, qui sit ut sacras literas interpretari possint? Alphons. a Castro advers. Hæres. lib. i. c. 4. versus medium, edit. Paris. 1534. (for both that at Antwerp, an. 1556, and that at Paris, an. 1571, have been in purgatory.) And such an ignorant as these was pope John XXIV. Platina, in Vita ejus; et Sect. 33. num. VI.

earth; for there is most infallible certainty of it, that is, of Sect. 39. the foundations of it, in scripture and the creeds; and it is so clearly delivered there, as that it needs no judge at all to sit upon it for the articles themselves. And so entire a body is this one faith in itself, as that the <sup>b</sup>whole church (much less the pope) hath not power to add one article to it, nor leave to detract any one the least from it. But when controversies arise about the meaning of the articles, or superstructures upon them, which are doctrines about the faith, not the faith itself, (unless where they be immediate consequences,) then both in and of these a <sup>c</sup>lawful and free general council, determining according to scripture, is the best judge on earth. But then suppose uncertainty in some of these superstructures, it can never be thence concluded that there is no infallible certainty of the faith itself. But it is time to end, especially for me, that have so many things of weight lying upon me, and disabling me from these polemic discourses, beside the burden of sixty-five years complete, which draws on apace to the period set by the prophet <sup>d</sup>David, and to the time that I must go and give God and Christ an account of the talent committed to my charge: in which God, for Christ Jesus' sake, be merciful to me; who knows that, however in many weaknesses, yet I have with a faithful and single heart (bound to his free grace for it) laboured the meeting, the blessed meeting of <sup>e</sup>truth and peace in his church; and which God, in his own good time, will (I hope) effect. To him be all honour and praise for ever. Amen.

<sup>b</sup> Resolutio Oechami est, Quod nec tota ecclesia, nec concilium generale, nec summus pontifex potest facere articulum, quod non fuit articulus. Sed ecclesia bene determinat de propositionibus catholicis, de quibus erat dubium, &c. Ja. Almain. in 3. Sent. D. 25. q. unica. Dub. 3.—Sicut ad ea quæ spectant ad fidem nostram, et nequaquam ex voluntate humana dependent, non potest summus pontifex, nec ecclesia de assertionem non vera, veram, nec de non falsa falsam facere, ita non potest de non catholica catholicam facere, nec de non hæretica hæreticam. Et ideo non potest novum articulum facere, nec articulum

fidei tollere. Quoniam sicut veritates catholice absque omni approbatione ecclesie ex natura rei sunt immutabiles, et immutabiliter, veræ, ita sunt immutabiliter catholice reputandæ. Similiter sicut hæreses absque omni reprobatione et damnatione sunt falsæ, ita absque omni reprobatione sunt hæreses reputandæ, &c.—Et postea: Patet ergo quod nulla veritas est catholica ex approbatione ecclesie vel pape. Gab. Biel. in 3. Sent. Dist. 25. q. unica. Art. 3. Dub. 3. versus finem.

<sup>c</sup> Sect. 26. num. I.

<sup>d</sup> Psalm xc. 10.

<sup>e</sup> Psalm lxxxv. 10.

## TABLE

OF THE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

- A**FRICANS, their opposing the Roman church, and separating from it, 142, &c. they are cursed and damned for it by Eulalius, and this accepted by the pope, 143. St. Augustine involved in that curse, *ibid.*
- Almain, Jac., against the pope's infallibility, 221. his absurd tenet touching the belief of scripture and the church, 67.
- Alphonsus a Castro, his confession touching the pope's fallibility, 221. his moderation touching heresy, 21. his late editions shrewdly purged, 222.
- Anselm, St., archbishop of Canterbury, how esteemed of by pope Urban II. 141.
- Apocrypha, some books received by the Trent Fathers which are not by Sextus Senensis, 282.
- Appeals, of, to foreign churches, 140—142. no appeal from patriarchs or metropolitans, *ibid.*
- Arians, the large spreading of them, 254. wherein they dissented from the orthodox Christians, 259.
- Aristotle falsely charged to hold the mortality of the soul, 91.
- Assistance, what promised by Christ to his church, what not, 76. 135, &c. 191, &c. what given to his church and pastors thereof, 78. 81. 199, 200. 212. 301.
- Assurance infallible, even by human proof, 101, 102.
- Augustine, St., cleared, 28. 46, 47. 67, 68. 103. 139, 140. 156, &c. righted, 113. 201—203. 296. his proofs of scripture, 82.
- Author, the, his small time to prepare for this conference, 18. his submission to the church of England, and the church catholic, 190, 191. the rule of his faith, 319. pride imputed to him, and retorted upon the imputers, 318, 319.
- Baptism, of anointing, use of spittle, and three dippings in it, 56. that of infants, how proved out of scripture, 45—47. acknowledged by some Romanists that it may be proved thence, 46. the necessity of it, 45. how proved by tradition, and St. Augustine's mind therein, 46, 47. that by heretics, schismatics, and sinners, not theirs but Christ's, 251.
- Basil, St., explained, 75.
- Beatitude supreme, how to be attained, 92.
- Belief of some things necessary before they be known, 64, 65. *vide Faith.*
- Bellarmino, his cunning discovered and confuted, 8—11. 172. his dissent from Stapleton, 32. and from Catharinus, 40. his absurd and impious tenet touching belief of scripture confuted, 71.
- Berengarius, his gross recantation, 276.
- Bernard, St., righted, 112, 113.
- Biel, his true assertion touching things that be *de fide*, 327.
- Bishops, their calling, and authority over the inferior clergy, 144—146. their places and precedencies ordered, *ibid.* the titles given them of old, 139. all of the same merit and degree, 166.
- Bodies representing and represented, their power, privileges, &c. compared together, 190, &c. 219.
- Brittany of old not subject to the see of Rome, 141, 142. St. Gildas his testimony concerning the antiquity of the conversion of it, 262. and that testimony vindicated, 263.
- Calvin and Calvinists for the real presence, 246, &c. 249.
- Campanella, his late eclogue, 175.
- Campian, his boldness, 120.
- Canterbury, the ancient place and power of the archbishops thereof, 141, 142.
- Capellus, his censure of Baronius, 124.
- Certainty, *vid. Faith.*
- Certainty of salvation, *vid. Salvation.*
- Christ's descent into hell, *vid. Descent.*
- Church, whereon founded, 9, 10. wherein it differeth from a general council,



22. no particular one infallible, 3, 4, 73, 74, &c. not that of Rome, 3, 4, 6, 7, &c. 13, 14. catholic church, which is it, 262, &c. her declarations, what fundamental, what not, 25. how far they bind, 25, 26. her authority not divine, 27. not in those things wherein she cannot err, 53. wherein she cannot universally err, 114, 115. 132. 200. what can take holiness from her, 115, 116. in what points of faith she may err, 132, 133. her errors and corruptions, how and by whom caused, 159. what required of her that she may not err, 161. she in the commonwealth, not the commonwealth in her, 167, &c. how she must be always visible, 267. the invisible in the visible, 114. of her double root, 311, 312. what the opinion of the ancients concerning it, 306, 307, &c. 310. a church and the church, how they differ, 104, 105, &c. by what assistance of the Spirit the church can be made infallible, 74. the authority of the primitive compared with that of the present church, 66.
- Church of Cæsarea, her title given by Gregory Nazianzen, 139.
- Church, Greek, vid. *Greek church*.
- Church of England a part of the catholic, 132, &c. where her doctrine is set down, 40, 41. her motherly dealing with her children, *ibid*. her articles and canons maintained, 41. of her positive and negative articles, 43, 44. her purity, 317. how safe to communicate with her, 314. what judges and rules in things spiritual she hath and acknowledgeth, 175. how she is wronged by the Roman, 263. salvation more certain in her than in the Roman, 273, &c.
- How one particular church may judge another, 137, &c. mutual criminations of the eastern and western, 147.
- Church, a, in Israel after her separation from Judah, 123.
- Church of Rome, wherein she hath erred, 15, 73. sometimes right, not so now, 107. though she be a true church, yet not right or orthodox, 104, 105. her want of charity, 19, 20. her determining of too many things, the cause of many evils, 40, 41. her severity in cursing all other Christians, 41, 42. how far she extendeth the authority of her testimony, 51. her rash condemning of others, 114—117. how she and how other churches apostolic, 312. how corrupted in doctrine and manners, 120, 121. she not the catholic church, 152, 311, 312. false titles given her, 316. her belief, how different from that of the ancient church, 275. other churches as well as she called *matres*, and *originales ecclesie*, 307, &c. a church at Jerusalem, Antioch, and (probably) in England, before one at Rome, 262. cardinal Peron his absurd tenet, that the Roman church is the catholic causally, 263. vid. *Errors, Pope, Rome*.
- Concomitancy in the eucharist, vid. *Eucharist*.
- Conference, the occasion of this, 1, 2. the Jesuit's manner of dealing in this, and in two former, 272.
- Confessions negative, made by churches, in what case needful, 128.
- Controversies, that in them consent of parties is no proof of truth, 231. 245. 255, &c.
- Councils, their fallibility, 190. 201. 207, 208, &c. 289. the infallibility they have is not exact but congruous infallibility, 212. whence and where it is principally resident, 213. 220. none of the present church absolutely infallible, 74. confirmation of them by the pope, a Roman novelty, 162. who may dispute against them, who not, 27, 28. 31. how inferiors may judge of their decrees, 206. a general council the only fit judge of the present controversies, 172. 176. and how that to be qualified, 125—128. 160, 161. 184, 185, &c. the bishop of Rome not always president in general councils, 178, 179. what impediments have been and now are of calling and continuing them, 163. what confirmation they need, 161, 162. 187. what of them lawful, what not, 179. &c. what obedience to be yielded to them erring, 185, 186. 215, 216, &c. what is the utmost they can do, 25. the words *Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis*, not used by any posterior council, 197. the first and latter councils differently assisted, 199. 212. whence they have their power and assistance, 190, &c. the prior may be amended by the posterior, 202, &c. what decrees of them are necessary to be believed, 206. how they are held by the Romanists to be infallible, 208. their decrees, by Stapleton held to be the oracles of the Holy Ghost, 198. that they are not prophetic in their conclusions, 208, 209. of their necessity and frequency, 162. that they may err, the whole church not erring, 215. their errors how to be amended, 128. how made of no worth at all by the Romanists

- without the pope, 220. councils and Fathers, how we are sure we have their true copies, 279, 280. conclusions of councils, how to be believed, 291, 292. their determinations not all of equal authority, 302. by whom they were and ought to be called, 177. 179. against the pope's being above a general council, 281, 326, 327. conditions required to make a council lawful, 180, 181. protestants invited to one upon doubtful and dangerous terms, 117.
- Of the council of Florence, and the Greeks their subscribing to it, 293.
- Council of Constance, her injurious proceeding against Huss, &c. 118. Becanus his defence of it confuted, *ibid.* its great error touching communion in one kind, 218.
- Council of Nice, the absence of the western bishops from it, how recompensed, 183. council of Afric in St. Cyprian's time, erred about baptism by heretics, 201.
- Council of Trent, how occasioned, and what an one it was, 125. not general nor legal, and so null, 177. 181. compared with ancient councils, 33, 34. 180, 181, &c. the blind pertinacy of the Fathers there, 118. her dangerous and wilful error concerning the intention of those that administer the sacraments, 229—231. claimed by Soto and Vega, for their contrary tenets, 40. of things there determined, 30. there the pope ought not to have sat as president, 177—179. bishops made of purpose to make a major part there, 182. more Italian bishops in it than of all Christendom beside, *ibid.* its addition of twelve new articles to the Creed, 287.
- Creed, that it is a rule of faith, 34. that it is wholly grounded on scripture, 36. some words added to it, why, and by whom, 11. Irenæus his famous testimony of it, 281. Athanasian Creed expounded and vindicated, 271, 288.
- Cyprian, St., cleared, 3, &c. and 6. and righted, 307.
- Cyril, St., of Alexandria vindicated, 10.
- Demonstrative reasons of greater force than any other human proof, 205. direct proof and demonstrative, how they differ, 44.
- Descent of Christ into hell, how held by the church of England, and how by those of Rome, 37, 38. 255.
- Dissent and difference in opinion, what may stand with the peace of the church, 303, 304.
- Disputations, their use, 104. when and how lawful for a private man to dispute with the whole church, 106. public disputations, how safe or available, 119—121. in what case to be admitted between the English and the Romish clergy, 120.
- Divinity, that it hath a science above it, and what, 100. the principles of it otherwise confirmed than those of any other art, 85, 86. 99, 100.
- Donatus, two of that name, 252.
- Donatists compared with the Romanists, 250—253. whether any of them living and dying so, had possibility of salvation, and which, 252, 253. whether they were guilty of heresy, *ibid.*
- Emperor, whom the Jesuits would have to be, 173, 174. *vide Pope.*
- Epiphanius cleared and vindicated, 153—155.
- Errors not fundamental, to whom, and in what case damnable, 268—270. 313. errors of councils, *vide Councils.* errors of the Roman church, wanting all proof from ancient councils and Fathers, 285, &c. 324. what be the most dangerous of them, 318. errors of papists, to whom fundamental, 280. *vide Church of Rome.*
- Eucharist, a threefold sacrifice in it, 257, 258. mutilated by the Roman church, 15. 218, 219. upon what hard terms the Bohemians were dispensed with, to have it in both kinds, 255. the papists tied by their own grounds to believe of it as the church of England doth, 241, &c. the church of England and other protestants believe Christ's real presence in it, 242. 243, &c. 246—249. concomitancy in it, Thomas of Aquin's fiction, confuted, 256. Bellarmine's notorious contradiction of Christ's being in it corporally present, 248, 249. his new and intricate doctrine touching transubstantiation, 275, 276. of the unbloody sacrifice and the bloody, how they differ, 257, 258. the propitiatory and gratulatory sacrifice, how they differ, *ibid.*
- Expositions, such only right as the thing expounded containeth, 25.
- Extravagants, the, censured, 177.
- Faith, how it is unchangeable, and yet hath been changed, 8. what is certain by the certainty of it, 31—33. not to be termed the Roman, but Christian or catholic faith, 111, &c. the two regular precepts of it, 33, &c. of its prime principles and how they differ from the articles of it, 35. the last resolution of it into what it should be, 51, &c. 72. 82, 83. 277. 288, 289, &c. faith acquired and faith infused, wherein

- either or both required, 59. how few things are essential to the faith, 303, 304. how its principles differ from those of sciences, 85. its foundation the scripture, 42, 43. by it man brought to his last happiness, 86. 88—90. how by it the understanding is captivated, 91. that it is an act produced by the will, 60, 61. 86. the principles of it have sufficient evidence of proof, 97. it and reason compared in their objects, &c., 210, &c. a latitude in it in reference to different men's salvation, 273. 305. things of two sorts belonging to it, 30. what by it to be believed explicitly, what not, 280, 281. of the perfection and certainty of it, 326, 327. of things not necessary to salvation no infallible faith can be among men, 301. foundation of faith, how shaken, 31. how fretted by those of Rome, 75. the catholic and now Roman faith not both one, 284. faith of scripture to be God's word infused by the Holy Ghost, 59, 60. the true grounds of it, 90—94. our faith of it how it differs from that of those who wrote scripture, 89, 90. faith of scripture, that it hath all perfections necessary, 93, 94. how firm and invincible it is, *ibid.*
- Felicity, what it is, and that the soul of man is capable of it, 91, 92.
- Ferus, his acknowledgment of the difference betwixt the first councils and the late ones, 199.
- Fundamental, what maketh a point to be such, 24—27. that decrees of councils are not such, 29. what points be so and what not, 21, 22. 26, 27. 33, 34, &c. 280, 281. not all of a like primeness, 35. all fundamentals held by the whole church, 22. points not fundamental, how and to whom necessary to salvation, 22, 23. firm and fundamental, how they differ, 29.
- Gerson, his ingenuity, 126.
- Ghost, Holy, how said to be lost, 17. his procession from the Son added to the Creed by the Roman church, 20. 124. the Greek church, her error touching this, 17. what, and how dangerous, 20.
- God, proof of the true one by testimony of the false ones, 63.
- Government of the church, in what sense monarchical, in what aristocratical, 165, 166, &c. how a monarchical not needful, 175. St. Gregory Nazianzen vindicated, 9. his humility and mildness, 139.
- Gregory VII. pope, the raiser of the papacy to the height, 171, 172. his twenty-seven conclusions, the basis of the papal greatness, 150.
- Greek church, notwithstanding her error, still a true church, 19. and justified by some Romanists, 20. her hard usage by the church of Rome, *ibid.* of her bishops, their subscription to the council of Florence, 292.
- Heresies, what maketh them, 25. the occasion of their first springing up, 162. how and by whom begun at Rome, 12, 13.
- Heretics, who, and who not, 133. none to be rashly condemned for such, 21. that some may pertain to the church, 133. who they be that teach that faith given to heretics is not to be kept, 117, 118.
- Hieronymus, St., explained, 7. 112. in what esteem he had bishops, 145.
- Hooker righted, 72, 73.
- James, St., believed to have been successor of our Lord in the principality of the church, 155.
- Idolaters, their gods how put down by Christian religion, 63, 64. idolatry, how maintained in the church of Rome, and with what evil consequences, 232, &c.
- Jeremias the Greek patriarch, his censure, 184.
- Jesuits, their manner of dealing in this conference, 272. their cunning in expounding the Fathers to their own purpose, 8. their confidence, 18. their arrogance, 77. their subtle malignity, 316. their attributing to themselves infallibility, 77. their desire of having one king as one pope, 82, 83. their late cunning argument to draw protestants to them, answered, &c. 250. their falsification of the author's words, 109, 110.
- Jesuitism, a perfect, 106.
- Jews, the ground of their belief of the Old Testament, 100.
- Images, how worshipped by the church of Rome, 15. against adoration of them, 232, 233. Cassander his complaint of it, 234. the flying from image-worship should not make us to run into profaneness and irreverence against God, 235.
- Infallible, two acceptions of it, 102. infallible and firm, how they differ, 161. the evils ensuing the opinion of the church's and the pope's infallibility, 181, &c. 218. 224. what an infallibility of the church Stapleton is forced to acknowledge, 212, 213. vide *Councils*, and *Pope*, and *Church*.
- Innocent III., his extolling the pope above the emperor, 170, &c.
- Invocation of saints, against, 232, 233.
- Irenæus vindicated, 150, &c. 322—325.

- Israel a church after her separation from Judah, 123.
- Judge, who to be in controversies touching faith and manners, 128, 129, &c. 137. 327. what judges of this kind the church hath, 161. 327. who to judge when a general council cannot be had, 163, 164. that no visible judge can prevent or remedy all heresy and schism, 165. a visible living judge of all controversies, whether always necessary, 165, &c. wherein private men may judge, and wherein not, 2. 189. 204.
- Keys, the, to whom given, and how, 156. 213, 214.
- Kings, *custodes utriusque tabulae*, 171. not to be tyrannized over by the pope, 158, 159. their supremacy in things spiritual, 170. some Romanists for the deposing and killing of them, 285.
- Knowledge of God, how difficult, 90, 91. what knowledge needful to breed faith, 70, 71. what degree of it is necessary to salvation, hard to determine, 273, 274. 305. the apostles' knowledge, how different from that of their hearers, 87, 88.
- Limbus patrum*, against, 255. 275.
- Literæ communicatoriæ*, what they were and of what use, 167.
- Lombard, Peter, condemned of heresy by the pope, 223.
- Maldonat answered, 186.
- Manichees, their foul heresy, and what stumbled them, 64.
- Manners, corruption in them no sufficient cause of separation, 120, 121.
- Martyrs, of the feasts made of old at their oratories, 233.
- Mass, the English Liturgy better and safer than it, 259. what manner of sacrifice it is made by them of Rome, 258.
- Matrrix* and *radix*, in St. Cyprian, not the Roman church, 308—311.
- Merits, against their condignity, 238.
- Miracles, what proofs of divine truth, 61. 87, 88. not wrought by all the writers of scripture, 88. what kind of assent is commonly given to them, *ibid.*
- Multitude no sure mark of the truth, 255.
- Novatians, their original, 3. 12.
- Novatian, how dealt with by St. Cyprian, 29. 309, &c.
- Obedience, of that which is due to the church and her pastors, 198.
- Occliam, his true resolution touching that which maketh an article of faith, 327.
- Origen, his errors obtruded by Rufinus, 7. he the first founder of purgatory, 293, 297.
- Papists, their denying possibility of salvation to protestants confuted and their reasons answered, 238—241. of their going to protestant churches and joining themselves to their assemblies, 316.
- Parents, their power over their children, 130.
- Parliaments, what matters they treat of and decree, 175, 176.
- Pastors, lawfully sent, what assistance promised to them, 77—79. their embassy, of what authority, 81.
- Patriarchs, all alike supreme, 140—142. 147. no appeal from them, 141, 142. 148.
- People, the unlearned of them saved by the simplicity of faith, 133.
- Perfidia*, the different significations of it, 4—6.
- Peter, St., of Christ's prayer for him, 134, 135. 157, 158. of his primacy, preeminency and power, 153, &c. 155. 193. in what sense the church is said to be built upon him, 155. that he fell, but not from the faith, 156, 157. whether he were universal pastor, 158. the highest power ecclesiastical, how given to him, and how to the rest of the apostles, 138, 139. 320, 321.
- Pope, not infallible, 2—7. 13—15. 74, 75. 157. 187. 327. how improbable and absurd it is to say he is so, 223, 224, &c. he made more infallible by the Romanists than a general council, 220. his infallibility held by some against conscience, 223, 224. if he had any it were useless, 227. how opposed by Alphonsus a Castro, 221, 222. the belief and knowledge of it, both of them impossible, 227. that he may err and hath erred, 173. that he may err as pope, 223, 224. preferred by some before a general council, 220, 221. not monarch of the church, 167. he hath not a negative voice in councils, 327. made by some as infallible without as with a general council, 220, 221. his confirmation of general councils of what avail, 231. of his power in France and Spain, 167, 168. 172. how much greater he is made by some than the emperor, 167, 168, &c. 174. his power slighted by some great princes, 167, 168. 172. whether he may be an heretic, and being one, how to be dealt with, 226. all his power, prerogatives, &c. indirectly denied by Stapleton, 38.
- Popes, the fall of some of them, and



- the consequents thereof, 121. of their power and principality, 138, 139, &c. 327. their subjection to the emperor, 146, 147. and how lost by the emperor, 148, 149. and how recovered, 149. primacy of order granted them by ecclesiastical constitutions, but no principality of power from Christ, 138, 139. some of them opposed by the African church, 142. some of them heretics, 157. some apostates, 222. some false prophets, 223. how unfit judges of controversies, 207, 208. &c. the lewd lives of many of them, 220, 221. pope Liberius his clear testimony against the pope's infallibility, 222.
- Prayer, what requisite that it may be heard, 161. 196, 197. prayer for the dead, that it presupposeth not purgatory, 207.
- Preachers, how their preaching to be esteemed of, 81. none since the apostles infallible, 300, 301.
- Precisians, their opposition to lawful ceremonies occasioned by the Romanists, 235. that there be of them in the Roman church no less than in the protestant, 111. their agreement in many things, 81.
- Princes, the moderation and equity of all that are good, 130. the power of sovereign princes in matters ecclesiastical, 140, 141. all of the clergy subject to them, 170.
- Prophecy, the spirit of it not to be attained by study, 208, 209.
- Protestants, why so called, 111. of their departing from the errors of the Roman church, 109—111. on what terms invited by Rome to a general council, 117, 118. their charitable grant of possibility of salvation in the Roman church, met with uncharitableness by the Roman party, 237, 238. they that deny possibility of salvation to them confuted, 239—241. their faith sufficient to salvation, 273, 274.
- Purgatory, not thought on by any Father within the three first hundred years, 293. not presupposed by prayer for the dead, 294. Origen the first founder of it, 293. 297. proofs of it examined, 294. 298. the purgatories mentioned by the Fathers, different from that believed by Rome, 294—296. the Fathers alleged for it cleared, 293, &c. the papists, their blasphemous assertion touching the necessity of believing it, 298. Bellarmine's contradiction touching the beginning of it, *ibid.*
- Reason not excluded or blemished by grace, 61, 62. the chief use of it, 64. what place it hath in the proof of divine supernatural truths, 49. 61. how high it can go in proving the truth of Christian religion, 62. 211.
- Reformation, in what case it is lawful for a particular church to reform herself, 122, &c. and to publish any thing that is catholic, in faith or manners, 123, 137. examples of it, 126, 127. reformation by protestants, how to be judged of, 125. faults incident to reformation and reformers of religion, 128. who the chief hinderers of a general reformation, 129. reformation of the church of England justified, 144. the manner of it, 127, 128. what places princes have in the reformation of the church, *ibid.*
- Religion, Christian, how the truth of it proved by the ancients, 62. the propagation of it, and the firmness where it is once received, 63, 64. the evil of believing it in one sort, and practising it in another, 314, 315. yet this taught by some Jesuits, and Romish priests, *ibid.* one Christian religion of protestants and Romanists, though they differ in it, 317. private men's opinions in religion, not to be esteemed the church's, 25. religion, as it is professed in the church of England, nearest, of any church now being, to the primitive church, 317.
- Resurrection, what believed by all Christians, what by some heretics denied, 259, 260.
- Revelation, private, in what case to be admitted, 62. divine, the necessity of it, 92.
- Rhenanus, B., purged on behalf of Rome, 310.
- Ridley, bishop, his full confession of the real presence, 248. his conviction of archbishop Cranmer's judgment touching it, 249.
- Romans, who truly such, and their true privilege, 5. Rome, her præter and superstructures in the faith, 8, 9. she and Spain compared in their two monarchies, 174. heresies both begun and maintained in her, 11, 12. wherein she hath erred, 15. whether impossible for the apostolic see to be removed thence, 15, 16. that she may apostatize, 16. her definitions of things not necessary, 26. she the chief hinderance of a general reformation, 139, &c. of her pretended sovereignty, and the bad effects of it, 129, 130. &c. what principality and power she hath, and whence, 138, 139, 145, &c. 152. she not the head of the church, nor did all churches depend on her, 141, 142. 150, 151. that she hath kept



- nor faith nor unity inviolated, 327. whether all Christians be bound to agree with her in faith, 150. and in what case they are so, 152. the ancient bounds of her jurisdiction, 152. possibility of salvation in her, and to whom, 133, &c. the danger of living and dying in her communion, 249—254. her rigour and cruelty beyond that of schismatical Israel, 250. her fundamental errors, of what nature, 268, 269. the catholic church her head and root, not she of it, 310, &c.
- Roman see, in what case a particular church may make canons, without consulting it, 124, 125, &c. 138.
- Romanists, their cunning dealing with their converts *in fieri*, 105. of their calling for a free hearing, 119, 120. their agreement with the Donatists, in contracting the church to their side, 242, 243. their danger, in different respects, lesser or greater than that of the Donatists, 252, 253.
- Rufinus, his pernicious cunning, 7. his dissent from the Roman church, 12, 13. branded by the pope with heresy, 15. his words explained, 10—12.
- Sacraments, against the necessity of his intention who administers them, 228, 229, &c. 258. 275.
- Sacrilege and schism usually go together, 128.
- Saints, against the invocation of them, 232, 233. they are made by Bellarmine to be *numina*, and in some sort our redeemers, *ibid.*
- Salvation, controversies amongst the Romanists about the certainty of it, 40.
- Schism, the heinousness of it, 120, 121. who the cause of it at this day, 109. 112. 159. the continuance of it, whence, 119.
- Schismatical church, to live in one, and to communicate in the schism, how different, 250. the protestants their leaving Rome, no schism, 159. of the schism of Israel, and those that lived there in the time of it, 123. 250.
- Science, supreme, what, 99.
- Scotus righted, 24.
- Scripture, that it was received and hath continued uncorrupt, 100. what books make up the canon of it, 13. all parts of it alike firm, not alike fundamental, 33. that it is the word of God is a prime principle of faith, 35, &c. 95, 96. 101. the sufficiency of it, 42. 95, 96. 103, &c. how known to be God's word, 48, &c. of the circular probation of scripture by tradition, and tradition by scripture, 48. 95. the different ways of proving it, 49. it is a higher proof than the church's tradition, 50. the testimony proving it must be divine and infallible, 54. 57. 59. whether it can be known to be God's word by its own light, 57, 58. and that the Roman church, by her own tenet, ought so to hold, 58. what the chief, and what the first inducement to the credibility of it, 67, 68. 72. 82, 83. 86. the divine light thereof, and what light the natural man sees in it, 67, 68. confirmation by double divine authority, 69. 82, 83. what measure of light is or can be required in it, 70, 71. as now set forth and printed, of what authority it is, 74. 80. scripture and tradition confirm either other mutually, not equally, 80. the way of the ancient church, of proving scripture to be God's word, 82. four proofs brought for it, *ibid.* the seeming contradiction of Fathers touching scripture and tradition reconciled, 84. belief of scripture, the true grounds of it, 90—92. rules of finding the true sense of it, 52. how rich a storehouse it is, 92, 93. the writers of it, what certainty we have who they were, 87. proof of its divine authority, to whom necessary, 95. infallible assurance of that authority by human proof, 10. that it is a rule sufficient and infallible, 163—165. three things observable in that rule, 164. its prerogative above general councils, 200. compared with church-definitions, 207. what assurance that we have the true sense of scriptures, councils, Fathers, &c. 277, 278, &c. some books of scripture anciently doubted of, and some not canonical, received by some into the canon, 58.
- Separation, actual and causal, 117, 118. for what one church may lawfully separate from another, 114, 115. 119, 120. corruption in manners no sufficient cause of separation, 120, 121. what separation necessary, 109.
- Sermons exalted to too great a height both by Jesuits and Precisians, 94. their true worth and use, *ibid.*
- Simanca, his foul tenet concerning faith given to heretics, 118.
- Sixtus Senensis, his doubting of some of the apocryphal books received by the council of Trent, 282.
- Socinianism, the monster of heresies, 260. archbishop of Spalatro made to speak for Rome, 298.
- Spirit, private, of the, 58, 59. 205, 206.
- Succession, what a one a note of the church, 322—324. not to be found in

- Rome, 325. Stapleton his inconstancy concerning it, 324.
- Testimony of the church, whether divine or human, 49. the testimony of it alone cannot make good the infallibility of the scripture, 53, 54.
- Theophilus of Alexandria, his worth, and his violent spirit, 146.
- Traditions, what to be approved, 36, 37. 42, 43. 54, 55. tradition and scripture proofs of the same things, 48. is not a sufficient proof of scripture, 49, 50. it and God's unwritten word not terms convertible, 54, 55. tradition of the present church, what uses it hath, 66, 67. 70. 102. how it differeth from the tradition of the primitive church, 66. 80. tradition of the church mere human authority, 73. what tradition the Fathers meant by saying, We have the scriptures by tradition, 84, 85. tradition apostolical, the necessity and use of it, *ibid.* tradition, how known before scripture, 97, 98. what most likely to be a tradition apostolical, 48, 49. the danger of leaning too much upon tradition, 99.
- Transubstantiation, against, 231. 242, 243. 247. 275. Suarez his plain confession that it is not of necessary belief, 242. Cajetan and Alphonsus a Castro their opinion concerning it, 286. scandal taken by Averroes at the doctrine of it, 276. vide *Eucharist*.
- True and right, their difference, 104, 105.
- Victor, pope, taxed by Irenæus, 150.
- Vincentius Lirinensis cleared, 31.
- Union of Christendom, how little regarded and how hindered by Rome, 258. 273.
- Unity, the causes of the breaches thereof, 304, &c. not that unity in the faith amongst the Romanists which they so much boast of, 282.
- Universal bishop, a title condemned by St. Gregory, yet usurped by his successors, 147, 148.
- Word of God, that it may be written and unwritten, 54. why written, 55, 56. uttered mediately or immediately, 54. many of God's unwritten words not delivered to the church, 56. vide *Scripture and Tradition*.
- Worth of men, of what weight in proving truth, 254.

*A Table of the places of Scripture which are explained or referred to.*

- Genesis i. 16. p. 169. 173.  
Deuteronomy iv. 2. p. 26. xiii. 1, 2, 3. p. 88. xxi. 19. p. 131. xvii. 18. p. 171.  
Judges vi. p. 164.  
1 Samuel iii. 13. viii. 3, 5. p. 131.  
3 Kings xii. 27. p. 123. xiii. 11. p. 250. xvii. p. 123. 249, 250. xix. 18. p. 249, 250.  
4 Kings iii. ix. 6. p. 123. 249. xxiii. 2. p. 127. 171.  
2 Chron. xxiv. 4. p. 171. xxix. p. 127.  
Psalms i. 2. xviii. 11. *et passim*, p. 93. lviii. 4. p. 317. lxxxv. 10. xc. 10. p. 327. xciv. 10. p. 86. cxix. 105. p. 68.  
Proverbs i. 8. vi. 20. 22. p. 216.  
Isaiah xliv. *et passim*, p. 58. liii. 1. p. 89.  
Jeremiah ii. 13. p. 283. v. 31. p. 99. xx. 7. xxxviii. 17. p. 89. xliv. p. 91.  
Ezekiel xiii. 11. p. 28.  
Hosea iv. 15. ix. 17. p. 123.  
Matthew iv. 19. p. 33. ix. 12. p. 47. x. 17. p. 155. xi. 28. p. 87. xii. 22. p. 64. xiii. 25. p. 108. xvi. 17. p. 64. 154. xvi. 18. p. 10. 115. 192. 134. 156. 291. xvi. 19. p. 38. xvi. 21. p. 33. xvi. 28. p. 200. xviii. 7. p. 109. xviii. 17. p. 216. 239. xviii. 18. p. 156. xviii. 19. p. 195. xviii. 20. p. 192. 195. xxii. 37. p. 306. xxvi. p. 217, 218. xxviii. 19, 20. p. 78. 155. 192. xxviii. 21. p. 135.  
Mark x. 14. p. 47. xiii. 22. p. 88.  
Luke i. 30. p. 54. ix. 23. p. 90. x. 16. p. 77. xii. 48. p. 305. xvi. 8. p. 74. xxii. 32. p. 38. 135. 156. 192.  
John iv. p. 83. v. 31. p. 72. v. 47. p. 55. 100. vi. 45. p. 92. vi. 70. p. 324. viii. 13. p. 72. ix. 29. p. 100. x. 4. p. 83. x. 41. p. 88. xi. 42. p. 158. xii. 48. p. 267. xiii. 13. p. 81. xiv. 16, 17. p. 79. 135. 192. xiv. 26. p. 192. xvi. 12, 13. p. 56. 79. 133. 136. 192. xvi. 14. p. 192. xvi. 26. p. 136. xvii. 3. p. 92. xix. 35. p. 87. xx. 22. p. 156. xxi. 15, 16. p. 38. 158.  
Acts i. 3. p. 56. ii. 38, 39. p. 46. iv. 12. p. 306. vi. p. 104. 163. 219. ix. 29. p. 104. xv. p. 163. 219. xv. 18. p. 197. xv. 28. p. 192. xvi. 32. p. 89. xix. 17. p. 104. xxviii. 25. p. 58.  
Romans i. 8. p. 5. 112. 286. i. 20. p. 49. 91. v. 15. p. 27. iii. 4. p. 301. x. 10. p. 317. x. 14, 15. p. 299. xi. 16. p. 116. xiii. 1. p. 170. xiv. p. 264. 284.  
1 Corinthians i. 10. p. 304. ii. 11. p. 267. ii. 14. p. 61. 68. 70. iii. 2. p. 158. iii. 11. p. 193. iii. 12. p. 266. iii. 15. p. 294. v. 5. p. 216. x. 15. p. 2. xi. 1. p. 78. 218. xi. 19. p. 165. 304. xi. 23. p. 217. xii. 3, 4. p. 59. xii. 10. p. 88. 209. xiii. 12. p. 71.  
2 Corinthians xi. 28. p. 138.  
Galatians i. 8. p. 61. 93. iii. 19. p. 54. v. 19—21. p. 251.  
Ephesians i. 23. p. 121. ii. 20. p. 193. iv. 5. p. 284. iv. 11. 13. p. 320, 321. v. 2. p. 256. v. 27. p. 316.  
Philippians ii. 2. p. 304.  
Colossians iii. 21. p. 131.  
1 Thessalonians i. 6. p. 78  
2 Thessalonians ii. 9. p. 88. ii. 15. p. 50. 58.  
1 Timothy iii. 15. p. 27. vi. 16. p. 91. vi. 20. p. 56  
2 Timothy i. 14. p. 56. vi. 16. p. 91.  
Hebrews v. 12. p. 158. ix. 12. x. 10. p. 256. xi. 1. p. 71. 86. xi. 6. p. 35. 306. xi. 37. p. 261. xii. 9. p. 130. xiii. 7. p. 215.  
James i. 20. p. 125.  
1 Peter i. 16. p. 92. ii. 21. p. 59. iii. 15. p. 211. v. 3. p. 74.  
2 Peter i. 16. p. 92. i. 19. p. 101.  
1 John iv. 2. p. 35.  
Jude 3. p. 58. 282.  
Apocalypse xii. 1. p. 172.















COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



0315024091

937

L3612

Relation of Conf. between  
All Land & Mr. Fisher

937

L3612

09417192

937.  
L3612 C1

BRITTLE DO NOT  
PHOTOCOPY



